

THE ANGLICAN FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL ACTION

by

Stephen F. Hopkins

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts in Theology.

University of St. Michael's College
(Toronto School of Theology)

1982

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	p.iv
Abbreviations	p.v
Introduction	p.1
I <u>AFSA's CONTEXT</u>	p.12
The Tradition Informing Malvern	p.13
The Malvern Conference	p.20
Canadian Responses to the Malvern Conference	p.35
II <u>AFSA's STORY</u>	p.53
Beginnings	p.53
Organization	p.62
Ways and Means: Social Action	p.72
Ways and Means: Church Reform	p.75
Allies	p.86
Opposition	p.94
Decline	p.111
III <u>AFSA's RESPONSE TO ALIENATION</u>	p.116
Alienation from Society	p.116
Alienation from the Church	p.123
The Church as an Agent of Social Transformation	p.143
Theological Ideas	p.148
Conclusion	p.166

ABBREVIATIONS

AFSA	Anglican Fellowship for Social Action
AO	<i>Anglican Outlook</i>
CC	<i>Canadian Churchman</i>
CCF	Cooperative Commonwealth Federation
CSL	Church Socialist League
CSS	Council for Social Service of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada
CSU	Christian Social Union
DCSS	Diocesan Council for Social Services (Montreal)
FCSO	Fellowship for a Christian Social Order
GSA	General Synod Archives, The Anglican Church of Canada, Toronto
GSJP	<i>General Synod, Journal of Proceedings</i>
GSM	Guild of St. Matthew
ICF	Industrial Christian Fellowship
SCC	Society of the Catholic Commonwealth
SDMJP	<i>Synod of the Diocese of Montreal, Journal of Proceedings</i>

NOTE: The word "Church" is used to refer to an institution such as the Church of England in Canada. The word "church" is used more generally to refer to the People of God, the Body of Christ.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank those AFSA members who agreed to be interviewed:
Dr. J.C. Flanagan, the Rev. V.I. Goring, the Rev. J.C. Kirby, the Rev.
J.O. Peacock, the Rev. S.L. Pollard, and Prof. C.H. Powles. I am especially
indebted to Prof. Powles for copies of important AFSA documents. I am also
grateful for the Rev. Elmer Smith's kind permission to use AFSA-related
material from the papers of the Rev. Frederick Hastings Smyth.

INTRODUCTION

Christendom is dead. No longer can it be claimed that ours is a society of believers ruled by faithful leaders and founded on values proclaimed by the Gospel. That this fact is becoming more widely acknowledged is good news -- at least it is good news inasmuch as Christendom was long ago buried by the secular powers. Unfortunately, the memory of a supposedly Christian society is still alive among the churches in North America. It is a kind of ghost wandering among empty pews and posing in stained glass windows. The illusion that our society as it is today is ultimately founded on Christian faith and values persists in the hearts and minds of the majority of Christians in this country. Indeed, it is a confidence in the respectability of their faith which binds many together, cutting across denominational lines at home and often separating the majority from their brothers and sisters abroad. There is, however, a growing minority among the faithful in North America who recognize that the Gospel demands commitment to a kingdom that is not of *this* world. These Christians have found it impossible to accept our society as it is and, inspired by the teaching and example of Jesus, have become involved in various attempts to change it. The men and women who constitute this minority have become critical of the *status quo* and have chosen to move "against the stream". While their experiences and analyses may vary, they all share this basic orientation to the world characterized by alienation from society, criticism of the *status quo*, and some kind of involvement in the struggle to transform it.

Roger Hutchison pointed to this orientation in his dissertation on the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order. Using categories derived from the work of Gibson Winter and Richard Allen, he developed a typology of relations

to the social order involving a "conservative", supportive tendency to accommodation on the one hand and a "radical", critical tendency to alienation.¹

In this thesis, I will use elements of his typology, understanding these tendencies as indicative of opposite stances or poles in a continuum of possible relations to the world. "Accommodation" represents a basic acceptance of society as it is, support of the *status quo*, and action to maintain it.

"Alienation" is characterized by a fundamental rejection of society as it is, criticism of the *status quo*, and action to change it. There is one element of Hutchison's typology which I will not use. Following Allen, he identified accommodation as "conservative" and alienation as "radical". This may be misleading, as it suggests that a tendency to accommodation necessarily represents a conservative ideology. While this element of the typology was appropriate to the studies of the Social Gospel and the FCSO for which it was developed, it fails to account for the type of conservatism that is an alienated response to society. Specifically, it does not account for the fact that the corporate view of society advocated by Edmund Burke or the Tractarians is conservative, yet represents an alienation from liberal bourgeois society. This is an important recognition in the study of Anglican groups, as such a corporate view has been the basis for some Anglican social theology.² Therefore, I will assume both radical and conservative ideologies to be indicative of alienation. The difference between the two lies in their understanding of the nature of society. The conservative wishes to critique and change the *status quo* in

¹ Roger Hutchison, *The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: A Social Ethical Analysis of a Christian Socialist Movement*. ThD dissertation, Victoria University, Toronto. May 1975. pp.7-16.

² See the discussion of this issue in Edward Alfred Pulker, *The Role of Anglicans in Reform of the Economic Order in Canada 1914-1945* PhD thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa. 1973. pp.14-31

accordance with an older vision of society that has been superceded by an individualistic liberalism. The radical bases his critique on the contradictions within the liberal *status quo* and seeks to effect change in accordance with a new vision of society.

The concern of this thesis is the tendency to radical alienation among Christians and the creation of theologically-informed, alternate visions of the world which it implies. Because this stand "against the stream" tends to place individuals and groups in a relatively powerless, minority position on the margins of the Church and society, the emotional and spiritual support of others is needed if the stand is to be maintained. Because theology tends to be written from an accommodated stand and alternate visions are rarely "given", intellectual resources are needed to facilitate the struggle for change. Such resources and supports can be found in dialogue with others, both Christians and non-Christians, who share the tendency to radical alienation and constitute the "protesting minority" in the Church and the world.³ Whatever the particular form of alienation experienced by an individual, the experience and reflection of others can inform his critique of the dominant forces in society and support him in articulating alternatives. The actions and struggles of progressive groups in the community -- co-operatives, anti-racism lobbies, women's collectives, citizens' committees, political bodies, workers' organizations, writers, artists, and theatrical companies -- can give one strength to carry on in one's own endeavours. Similarly, the work of Christian thinkers who have attached themselves to or are participating in movements against the stream can provide tools for theological reconstruction. Elements of an alternate vision of the Church and society can be found in the writings of liberation theologians

³ The term "protesting minority" is used in Douglas Hall, *The Canada Crisis: A Christian Perspective* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1980) p.85.

in the Third World, political theologians in Germany, some social ethicists, and black and feminist theologians in North America.

It is also helpful to look to the past. Through a reconsideration of those individuals and groups in one's history who found it impossible to accept the world as they experienced it and moved against the forces dominant in society at the time, one may discover helpful ideas and symbols. Older categories and formulae may take on new meaning. One may also discover stories which can be spiritual resources for those working to build a more just society. More important, perhaps, one may recover a sense of continuity with history as one comes to identify with a past that is relevant to the alienation experienced in the present.

Such an attempt to recover historical sources has been made by others. Letty M. Russell calls it a search for a "usable past" and recognizes the importance of such an approach for feminist theology.⁴ James H. Cone considers a re-interpretation of black history to be a source for black theology.⁵ In Canada, this look to the past has usually led to a consideration of the Methodist Social Gospel tradition and the history of Canadian socialism as resources.⁶ In the introduction to his work on the FCSO, Roger Hutchison wrote,

A re-examination of the social gospel will help us to rediscover resources in our Canadian experience for social ethics and social action, and to assess the merits and limitations of contemporary attempts to understand and transform society.⁷

4. Letty M. Russell, *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective: A Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974) pp.72-103

5. James H. Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation* (Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1970) pp.53-60.

6. An appreciation of the importance of the Social Gospel and the tradition of the CCF in this regard was evident in two conferences held in 1977. See B.G. Smillie, ed. *Political Theology in the Canadian Context* (Unpublished papers of the conference held at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, March 10, 11, 1977) pp.3,63,167 and Gregory Baum, "A Look to the Past for the Sake of the Future" in *Institute for Christian Life in Canada* (Proceedings of the 1977 Conference, August 21-27, 1977) pp.34f

7. Hutchison, *FCSO*, p.1

A similar approach underlies Gregory Baum's study of *Catholics and Canadian Socialism*.⁸ There are also specifically historical works which serve to make present these elements of the Canadian experience. Two of these are Stewart Crysdale's *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada* and Richard Allen's *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-1928*.⁹ Unfortunately, none of these deals adequately with the contributions to be made by the Anglican tradition in Canada.

An attempt to fill this gap was made by Edward Alfred Pulker in his dissertation on *The Role of Anglicans in Reform of the Economic Order in Canada 1914-1945*. Pulker was critical of Crysdale and Allen because, in general, their work focused on the Methodist-United Church tradition and assumed the value of a Church's role in social change to be a function of its acceptance of the social gospel.¹⁰ His denominational study was an effort to show that "the social gospel was in fact not the influence among Anglicans that it was among other Protestants." He suggested as a general rule that "the basis for Anglican interest in reform was the conservative tradition that society is a corporate unity within which all parts have a responsibility for the welfare of each other."¹¹ He identified Edmund Burke as the proponent of the paradigmatic conservative view. While he acknowledged the possibility of exceptions to the general rule, Pulker claimed that "Canadian Anglicans tended to share with (Burke) a belief in certain principles which came from their common inheritance of the Anglican

⁸ Gregory Baum, *Catholics and Canadian Socialism: Political Thought in the Thirties and Forties* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1980) p.212

⁹ Stewart Crysdale, *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada* (Toronto, 1961) and Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-1928* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973)

¹⁰ Pulker, *Role of Anglicans in Reform*, pp.5, 343

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.6

tradition."¹² Some of these principles were: that the destiny of individuals and of society lies in the hands of Providence, not in human ability; that the government, as the agent of God, should be the source of reform in society; that continuity with the past is important and evolution, not revolution, should be the mode of change; that society is a corporate unity in which each individual has his particular role or vocation; and that human nature is selfish and will therefore tend to corrupt any social organization.¹³ Pulker centred on the corporate vision of society and showed that, because it opposed the assumptions of laissez-faire capitalism, it could, and indeed did, become a basis for reform of the economic order in Canada. He also noted that the interdependence implied by this vision opposed the individualism of the Evangelical wing of the Church.¹⁴

While Pulker's analysis is true of the majority of official Church pronouncements in Canada, it does not acknowledge adequately the ways in which this corporate world view was assimilated by the Christian Socialist tradition from Maurice to Temple and transformed into a primarily theological world view to support a radical alienation. There were other Anglicans, as deeply rooted in their tradition as Burke was, who found the seeds of an alternate and progressive vision in the corporate understanding of the nature of society. Pulker's work is also misleading if it suggests that only Anglicans have relied on such an anti-individualistic, corporate view. As Roger Hutchison shows in his dissertation, a primarily United Church group, the FCSO, developed a vision of society based on the concept of "mutuality".¹⁵ Important elements of this

¹² *Ibid.*, p.18

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp.14-18

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.24f

¹⁵ Hutchison, *FCSO*, pp.28f

vision were "the discernment of the essential structure of the social order as a whole" and "beliefs in the unity of life, and in the importance of viewing man as a social being who is characterized by individuality and relatedness,"¹⁶ Thus the FCSO points to a corporate view of society that was used as the basis of a radical critique.

In this thesis I will examine another expression of this alternate vision. The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action (AFSA) was a Canadian group which looked to the distinctively Anglican tradition of incarnational theology which transcended the conservative world view and used its corporate vision to support a tendency to radical alienation. AFSA's story may be a spiritual resource to others who feel themselves to be at odds with the world as it is and marginalized within the Church.

To date, there has been only one work written specifically on AFSA: an M.Th. thesis prepared for Trinity College, Toronto, in 1974 by Edward J.E. Morgan.¹⁷ It provides a helpful sketch of AFSA's history, but it falls short in its documentation and fails to appreciate the group's relationship to the FCSO, the Christian Socialist tradition in Britain, and, especially, William Temple. The need for a deeper consideration is evident. No doubt one of the problems encountered by Morgan (this may be a partial explanation of his thesis' weaknesses) was the lack of available material on AFSA. Even the existing denominational histories only mention the group; Archbishop Carrington's *The Anglican Church*

16. *Ibid.*, p.245 n.8

17. Edward J.E. Morgan, *The Anglican Church and Social Action: The Effect of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action on the Development of Social Action in the Anglican Church of Canada* (M.Th. thesis, Toronto School of Theology [Trinity College], Toronto, 1974)

*in Canada: A History*¹⁸ has only one paragraph (which he places incorrectly in a discussion of the Depression), and John Irwin Cooper's history of the Diocese of Montreal, *The Blessed Communion*,¹⁹ fares only slightly better with a couple of pages focussing on AFSA members' actions in Diocesan Synod and its committees. A much more helpful resource (probably unavailable to Morgan) is Pulker's thesis. He provides a good background for a study of AFSA and his treatment of the group is well supported by footnotes and personal interviews with some AFSA members from Nova Scotia.²⁰ In this thesis, I will confine myself to a consideration of the AFSA group in Montreal. While there were AFSA units in Nova Scotia, Toronto, and New Jersey, the Montreal group was the first and the most active.

The primary sources are varied. *The Canadian Churchman* for the years 1940 to 1955 and *The Montreal Churchman* for the years 1940-1946 (when it ceased publication) are helpful, as AFSA members occasionally used these as vehicles for making their views known. Similarly, the *Journals of Proceedings* of both General Synod and Montreal Diocesan Synod can indicate whether or not AFSA members were on certain committees or introduced specific motions in the Church courts. Unfortunately, these official records do not give an account of the actual debates but are limited to reports, motions, and decisions.

The most important primary sources are *The Anglican Outlook and News Digest*, collections of personal papers, and the reminiscences of AFSA members. *Anglican Outlook* was founded in 1945 as an alternative to the more conservative *Canadian Churchman*. As such, the *Outlook* became a sympathetic medium for AFSA. The group was involved in decisions related to editorial policy as early as

¹⁸ Philip Carrington, *The Anglican Church in Canada: A History* (Collins: Toronto, 1963)

¹⁹ John Irwin Cooper, *The Blessed Communion* (The Archives Committee of the Diocese of Montreal, 1960)

²⁰ Pulker, *Role of Anglicans in Reform*, pp.291-309

October, 1946, and in March, 1949, AFSA members in Montreal assumed responsibility for both the production and editorial content of the paper. For this reason, and given that editorials were discussed in AFSA meetings before publication, I will consider unsigned editorials published after March, 1949 to be indicative of "AFSA's position". It was widely acknowledged that *Anglican Outlook* was the "semi-official organ" of the Fellowship, although it is likely that the paper out-lived AFSA. *Anglican Outlook* became the *Christian Outlook* in 1960.

The personal papers of those involved in AFSA are the only source of original AFSA documents, of which I have located three: the "Manifesto";²¹ a "Bulletin" by John Peacock titled *A Christian Economic System*,²² and; a copy of the *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action*.²³ The letters of the Rev. Frederick Hastings Smyth have been an invaluable resource for an understanding of the Fellowship's relationship with the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth and some of the divisions that existed within the AFSA membership.

Interviews with former members and their contemporaries are important for adding detail and colour to the sketches provided by the documentary material. Not only do the personalities and stories of the actors provide a more immediate sense of AFSA, but their recollections help in discerning the relative importance of certain ideas and issues. I have interviewed six former members:

²¹ The AFSA "Manifesto", n.d., 4pp. Papers of C.H. Powles; Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth, and; *Montreal Churchman* (April 1945) p.7

²² John Peacock, *A Christian Economic System* (also known as "AFSA Bulletin #1"), n.d., 4pp. Papers of C.H. Powles

²³ *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action*, n.d., 8pp. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth

Dr J.C. "Flynn" Flanagan; the Rev. S.L. Pollard; the Rev. J.C. Kirby; the Rev. J.O. Peacock; the Rev. V.I. Goring, and; the Rev. C.H. Powles. It would have been interesting and informative, although perhaps more confusing, to have interviewed more of the actors involved, but this has not been possible due to the time and distance involved. Similarly, there are potentially useful collections of personal papers to which I have not had access. These oral and written sources would have to be investigated fully before a more complete and authoritative historical study of AFSA could be produced.

In studying AFSA, I am looking for spiritual and theological resources. AFSA has already functioned as a spiritual resource to many who have heard of the group and are excited that such a group existed. There has developed a kind of "standard version" of the story which is somewhat romanticized. It pits a helpless, but dedicated cluster of forward-looking priests, against the massed forces of the "blue meanie" businessmen and their conniving bishop. I hope this myth can be refined. In looking to AFSA for spiritual resources, I will describe the group and its alienation. What issues did AFSA work on? How did it act for social change? How did it relate to other groups? How did it deal with opposition? Dealing with these questions demands an historical approach. The first two chapters will deal with the background, development, struggles, and decline of the group.

In looking to AFSA for theological resources, I will describe the group's thinking. In what terms did AFSA articulate its alienation? What theological ideas or images did it use to defend its stance against the *status quo*? And what was the alternate vision on the basis of which they advocated a transformation of society? As no AFSA member has produced a systematic theology, there are theological questions in answer to which we can only sketch elements of

an "AFSA position". However, there is sufficient material on the group's thinking to point us to major sources which are well-documented, such as William Temple. The final chapter will deal with the group's alienation from capitalism, its critique of the Church, and the theological vision of human-ness which it presented. In the Conclusion, I will reflect on AFSA's usefulness as a resource for Christians alienated from a post-Christian society and living at the margins of the church.

CHAPTER 1
AFSA's CONTEXT

In his history of the church in Canada, John Webster Grant noted a flourishing of social concern among Anglicans during the Second World War.¹ This movement was closely linked with William Temple. While there were various individuals and unofficial groups seeking to relate Christian faith to the life of society at this time (notably the Industrial Christian Fellowship and the Christendom Group in Britain and the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order in Canada), it was Temple who became most closely identified with social concern in the minds of Canadian Anglicans. This was, no doubt, a function of his public profile as Archbishop of York (1929-1942) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1942-1944). It would be perhaps most correct to say that Temple acted as a mediator of the British Christian Socialist tradition to Canadian Anglicans troubled by the economic hardships of the Depression and the international crisis of the Second World War. Since his role in this respect came to the fore with the Malvern Conference,² Malvern is a good starting point for a consideration of the factors which combined to create a situation in which a group such as AFSA could emerge. The Conference highlighted Christian social responsibility at a time when Canadian Anglicans were especially receptive to an alternate vision of corporate life. It was the first wave in the tide of wartime hope for a more just social order. Malvern is also important to this

¹ John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era: The First Century of Confederation*. Vol. III of *A History of The Christian Church in Canada*, ed. by John Webster Grant (3 vols.; Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1973) p.153

² Cf. Owen C. Thomas, "William Temple," in *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, ed. by William J. Wolf (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1979) p.111

study because it anticipated a central element of the reaction that would stem the tide after the war. In this chapter I will outline the tradition of "incarnational" or "sacramental" socialism which informed the Malvern Conference and I will describe the Conference's *Findings*. I will then examine the reception of Malvern by the official Church in Canada and the unofficial response made by Charles Feilding. Finally, I will describe the reactionary mood which came to dominate North America following the war.

The Tradition Informing Malvern

The Malvern Conference united, if only briefly, several streams in the movement which had originated with F.D. Maurice and the Christian Socialists of the 1850's. Maurice B. Reckitt noted that, in the 1880's, the social movement in the Church of England began to develop in two directions "inter-related in principle but tending to evolve independently in practice." These were:

- i) An intellectual quest for the re-statement of the Christian Law as the ultimate authority to rule social practice.
- ii) A semi-political movement, in which men who spoke in the name of the Church go beyond practical work of social reform to identify themselves with the contemporary demands of democracy for social justice.³

The first of these I would call the "broad stream" of the movement, not because it was "Broad Church" (for it was generally Anglo-Catholic), but because it tended to have a wider appeal and was, therefore, larger in numbers. The second, although no less important in its influence, was smaller in numbers and tended to be more explicitly and exclusively Anglo-Catholic and socialist. Both the search for a re-statement of Christian faith and the identification with "secular" calls for social justice were represented at Malvern, although

³ Maurice Reckitt, *Church and Society in England from 1800*, Vol. III of *The Church and the World: Being Materials for the Historical Study of Christian Sociology*, ed. by Cyril E. Hudson and Maurice B. Reckitt (3 vols.; London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1940) p.125

conflict between the two streams was evident in the debate over socialism. As we shall see, the Industrial Christian Fellowship represented the broad stream. The Christendom Group represented the broad stream, but it was historically rooted in the smaller stream and tended to carry its theological and political allegiances.

It is interesting that both streams found their earliest expressions in two men born in 1847, just before the failure of the People's Charter and the "seven years" of the Christian Socialist group founded by Maurice, Kingsley and Ludlow. Both men were educated at Eton under the same tutor, William Johnson, a follower of Maurice. The broad stream is represented by Henry Scott Holland; the smaller stream by Stewart Duckworth Headlam.

In 1877, Headlam founded the Guild of St. Matthew (GSM) in his working-class parish of Bethnal Green.⁴ This group was the first to wed Maurician universalism and its emphasis on the Incarnation with the sacramentalism of the Tractarians. Maurice himself had had sympathies with the Oxford Movement in his early days, but he broke with Pusey over the meaning of baptism.⁵ The GSM brought the two movements together. Headlam, like Maurice, considered nothing in this world to be "secular". Rather, with the Tractarians, he stressed the sacraments, seeing in them the means by which the whole creation is sanctified. In the Incarnation and the Mass he found a faith that was essentially social. In this regard Reckitt wrote,

For Headlam Christianity was not a religion merely of "Social implications," to use a phrase that has become fashionable since his time; it was the sole sufficient foundation for a true way of life, justifying, on divine authority, a claim to penetrate

⁴ On the GSM, see Peter d'A. Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914: Religion, Class, and Social Conscience in Late-Victorian England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968) Chap. V, "Stewart Headlam and the Guild of St. Matthew, 1877-1909," pp.99-163

⁵ Jones *Revival*, p.92. See also Alec R. Vidler, *F.D. Maurice and Company* (London: SCM Press, 1966) pp.96f

and transform the whole social order.⁶

In emphasizing strongly the centrality of the sacraments as expressive of the unity of human existence under God and as the means through which the church extends His Kingdom, Headlam and the GSM represent the smaller stream.

The broad stream is represented by the Christian Social Union (CSU) founded in 1889.⁷ The CSU grew out of a group of Oxford dons known as "The Holy Party". It was this group involving Scott Holland, Charles Gore, and J.R. Illingworth which also inspired the famous collection of essays titled *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation* (1889).⁸ The Christian Social Union and the Guild of St. Matthew did share a common ground: a synthesis of Maurice and the Tractarians. Peter Jones writes,

The theology of social-unionism flowed out of the Tractarian-Maurice-Headlam stream. *Lux Mundi* was a further development of Tractarian theology, combining the "Catholic Church" of Pusey with the⁹ "Kingdom of Christ" of Maurice, as Headlam did.

The difference between the two groups lay in the CSU's emphasis on the study of social and economic issues and the formation of Christian thought in relation to these *versus* the GSM's advocacy of specific reforms and a more explicit sacramental emphasis. According to Jones, the Christian Social Union reached its peak of influence in the Pan-Anglican Congress at Lambeth in 1903. He writes,

By 1908 the CSU had thoroughly permeated the Church of England, especially the hierarchy; it was a form of "socialism" for bishops. Its achievements were

⁶ Maurice B. Reckitt, *Faith and Society: A Study of the Structure, Outlook and Opportunity of the Christian Social Movement in Great Britain and the United States of America* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932) p.85

⁷ On the CSU, see Jones, *Revival*, Chap. VI; "The Christian Social Union, 1889-1919," pp.164-224

⁸ Charles Gore, ed. *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation* (2nd ed., London: John Murray, 1890)

⁹ Jones, *Revival*, p.167

partly to be seen in the growing awareness of social problems and sympathy to labour shown by successive annual Church Congresses. The meetings of the 1870's had ignored economic and social matters; those before World War I were dominated by them. Pulling the church in a Maurician-socialist direction helped to stretch its mind.¹⁰

After 1908, however, the Christian Social Union declined rapidly. Its radical wing had been lost to the Church Socialist League and the First World War proved a severe blow. Finally, in 1919, the CSU joined with the Navy Mission, an organization devoted primarily to evangelism, to form the Industrial Christian Fellowship.

The Guild of St. Matthew was formally disbanded in 1909, as it had ceased to be active or effective. Many of its members had joined the Christian Social Union and the Guild had, in a sense, been superceded by the Church Socialist League (CSL).¹¹ By 1906, some Christian socialists were dissatisfied with the CSU, sensing that its moderation and emphasis on study had rendered it anemic. At the same time, the GSM was seen to be too vague in its goals and too rigorous in its ritualism.¹² The official establishment of the Labour Party and the election of a significant number of socialist MP's provided a focus for this discontent which eventually led to the formation of the Church Socialist League in 1906. This group defined itself as follows:

The Church Socialist League consists of Church people who accept the principles of socialism, viz.: The political, economic and social eman-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.217

¹¹ On the CSL see *Ibid.*, Chap. VII, "Northern Radicalism: The Church Socialist League, 1906-1924," pp.225-302

¹² See *Ibid.*, pp.238 and 239

cipation of the whole people, men and women, by the establishment of a *democratic commonwealth in which the community shall own the land and capital collectively* and use them for the good of all.¹³

The leadership of the CSL was, for the most part, Anglo-Catholic. At least two important leaders, Conrad Noel and P.E.T. Widdrington, were members of the Guild of St. Matthew and strongly influenced by Headlam's sacramentalism. The CSL's combination of explicitly socialist politics with Anglo-Catholic theology would support Jones' conclusion that "the Church Socialist League was more the heir of the GSM than it was of the Christian Social Union."¹⁴ Its emphasis on support of social democracy places it within the second, smaller stream of the tradition. However, it was not a homogenous group and eventually internal disagreements over Anglo-Catholic dogmatism and official endorsement of the Labour Party led to its fragmentation. In 1918, Conrad Noel left the Church Socialist League with some kindred spirits to form his Catholic Crusade, a group which combined economic radicalism with uncompromising Anglo-Catholicism. Jones writes,

For Noel "Nonconformity" and "Christo-Capitalism" were synonymous terms of abuse. Christian socialism he regarded as the monopoly of Anglo-Catholics. Nevertheless, his Catholic Crusade, with its religious limitations, was "radical": it claimed to champion for society at large "a classless, co-operative world of free men and free nations."¹⁵

It would appear, however, that Noel's Crusade devoted more and more of its energies to fighting "the soul-saving gang and their glory-for-me religion"¹⁶ and that his sectarianism resulted in the Crusade's becoming "a somewhat

¹³ Quoted in *Ibid.*, p.241

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.238

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.301

¹⁶ This was Noel's term for Nonconformists and Protestantism, quoted in *Ibid.*, p.300

isolated and extremely unconventional little body."¹⁷ Those left in the Church Socialist League eventually rallied around the "Group of Churchmen" who published a collection of essays titled *The Return of Christendom*¹⁸ in 1922.

Two of the most influential leaders of this latter group, P.E.T. Widdrington and Maurice Reckitt, were suspicious of tendencies within the Church Socialist League to support unequivocally the collectivist stands being adopted by the Labour Party. Jones says that, "Reckitt, Widdrington, and other Leaguers feared the expansion of Bureaucracy and 'State Capitalism' under Fabian and collectivist auspices."¹⁹ Widdrington was more oriented to theological reflection and sought to develop a "Christian Sociology", that is, a vision of society built upon a specifically theological foundation. He feared that the Church Socialist League had tended to adopt a secular programme and "seemed sometimes to present Christianity merely as the spiritual counterpart of this."²⁰ Widdrington and the group around him represented what Reckitt called "the quest for the autochthonous,"²¹ a search for the grounds of a social critique at the roots of the faith, in Scripture and Catholic doctrine. Of this search Reckitt said it was a case of *reculer pour mieux sauter*:

¹⁷ Reckitt, *Faith and Society*, p. 162

¹⁸ A Group of Churchmen, *The Return of Christendom* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1922)

¹⁹ Jones, *Revival*, p.289

²⁰ Reckitt, *Faith and Society*, p.157

²¹ Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple*, p.169

It led backwards, first to the Gospels themselves for the recovery of the idea of the Kingdom as something essentially constitutive of human order, and secondarily to medieval Christendom, in which, amid all the social limitations of feudalism and the spiritual evils of ecclesiasticism, there was nevertheless a conscious and not unsuccessful effort to incarnate a Christian interpretation of life in the institutions of society.²²

Reckitt came to the group quite naturally, for he favoured a Guild Socialist option as opposed to the centralizing and collectivist tendencies he perceived in the Church Socialist League.²³ The appeal of Guild Socialism to members of the CSL disillusioned by the Labour Party was strong. Jones wrote,

Christian socialists could find in the Guild movement a system which they hoped would preserve individual choices and freedoms, guard against the secular excesses of centralized administration, and give to the workers and producers a genuine and direct voice in running the national economy. ...
.....
In its pluralism, Guild Socialism offered protection for the churches in a secular world and seemed to vindicate the decentralized society of the medieval ideal, naturally attractive to the Anglican religious mind.²⁴

In 1923, following the publication of *The Return of Christendom*, "the Guild Socialist and 'Christian-sociology' rump" of the Church Socialist League formed the League of the Kingdom of God.²⁵ This League was "anti-plutocratic" in its critique of society and definitely Catholic in its theology, although it did not fall victim to the exclusivity and sectarianism of Noel and the Catholic Crusade. Later, in 1925, Widdrington and others initiated the Anglo-Catholic Summer School of Sociology, an annual event which sought to contribute to "the awakening of Churchmen to the lost traditions of Christendom and the recreation of a Christian sociology consonant with the needs of

22. *Ibid.*, p.168

23. On the CSL and Guild Socialism, see Jones, *Revival* pp. 281-295

24. *Ibid.*, P.290 and 291

25. *Ibid.*, p.296

the age."²⁶ Still later, in 1933, members of the League of the Kingdom of God and others associated with the Summer School began the journal *Christendom* under Reckitt's leadership. "The Christendom Group" is the name given to the informal group which identified itself with the Christian Sociology approach of the journal. Besides Widdrington and Reckitt, V.A. Demant, T.S. Eliot, W.G. Peck, and Ruth Kenyon were closely associated with the Group. In its identification with the call for industrial democracy and its advocacy of specific, Guild Socialist, options, the League of the Kingdom of God and the Christendom Group represent the smaller stream of the tradition inherited from the Guild of St. Matthew and the Church Socialist League. However, in their Christian Sociology and the attempt to reformulate a theological basis for social reconstruction, Widdrington, Reckitt, and their followers represent the broad stream of the Christian Social Union. Elements of both are evident in the *Findings* of the Malvern Conference, which drew heavily on the Christian Sociology of the Christendom Group.

The Malvern Conference

The Malvern Conference was itself a response to the Depression and the War. With the mobilization of Britain for war, some critical Christians became aware of a contradiction in the nation's inability to feed and employ everyone in peacetime (as had been the case during the Depression) and its apparent ability to do so in the face of war. This realization led to questions of post-war reconstruction: would Britain lack the national will to see all its people fed, clothed, and housed after the war as it had before? The situation prompting the question was apparently experienced by many Britons. Iremonger

26. Reckitt, *Faith and Society*, p.159

writes,

The war had hardly broken out when the question what was to be done at the end of it began widely to be asked. The word "reconstruction" recurred, with prominence, in the speeches of politicians, the sermons of preachers, and the agenda papers of societies and committees. Men in the Services -- some of whom had not forgotten the promised "homes for the heroes" of twenty years before -- were assured there was to be no repetition of the aftermath of the First World War, no mass unemployment, no tedious misery of the dole; and conferences were held to draw up schemes, pledges, and manifestoes for the encouragement of the fighting men and the welfare of the country to which they hoped to return.²⁷

The initiative for a conference of Church people to consider post-war reconstruction and the ordering of society on Christian principles came from the Industrial Christian Fellowship, a group which the *Canadian Churchman* described as "somewhat parallel in aims" to the FCSO.²⁸ In the early summer of 1940, Temple agreed to act as convenor and chairman.

Temple's understanding of Malvern's purpose is important because it points to a contextual method in theology. He considered the Conference to be a conscious attempt to think in relation to the situation, to theologize in dialogue with the world. This is apparent in his letter of invitation to Malvern in which he said the purpose of the Conference would be "to consider from the Anglican point of view what are the fundamental facts which are directly relevant to the ordering of the new society that is quite evidently emerging, and how Christian thought can be shaped to play a leading part in

27. F.A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters* (London: Oxford University Press, 1948) p.428

28. *CC*, Feb. 13, 1941, p.101

the reconstruction after the war is over."²⁹ Temple was anxious to "capitalize" on what he perceived to be a turning point in the life of society created by the war and an increase of hope among Christians for "international and social justice". This concern was also expressed in an open letter to J.H. Oldham titled "Begin Now" and published in the *Christian News-Letter* of August, 1940. The letter was reprinted in Canada in November of that year in the *Bulletin* of the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada. With respect to the "crisis in world events" Temple wrote,

If we are to rise to the test of the present and the opportunity for which we hope in the future, there must be a rapid crystallisation of much that is now fluid in Christian sentiment and aspiration. ... We need two things: a gathering together of the great mass of Christian sentiment which undoubtedly exists, and the direction of this towards some definite goal.³⁰

He understood the task of the church to be a clarification of theological ideas as a response to the immediate crisis and as a step in the creation of a firm foundation for post-war reconstruction. In this respect, then, he sought to build a contextual theology.

In his letter to Oldham, Temple went on to stress the need to move beyond the generalities which had characterized so many statements on the social order to detailed and specific proposals. For instance, he felt it was necessary to move from the declaration that fellowship among persons is the Will of God to a condemnation of the profit motive and the competitive system which it created. Rather than declaring that all should have enough to eat, he wanted to move to a criticism of an economic order which destroyed food in order to protect the profits of the producer and without regard for the needs

29. William Temple, quoted in Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.429

30. William Temple, "Begin Now," reprinted in CSS, *Bulletin*, #101 (Nov. 28, 1940) p.1

of the hungry consumer.³¹ He used the notion of natural law to express positively what these condemnations expressed negatively. In general, he considered the profit-based economy to engender a reversal of the natural order in which consumption should control production and production financing. He therefore saw the purpose of his specific proposals to be a reversal of the reversal and a recovery of the natural order in every area of public life.³²

This position, sketched by Temple in his letter to Oldham, became the dominant theme in the Malvern Conference. The tone was set by Temple in his opening address, when he said their purpose was "to work out the principles of Christian living in the political and economic realms, and the proper relation of these in the 'natural order' to the other departments of life and especially to man's destiny as a child of God."³³ That Temple was able to shape and refine the goal of the Conference is an indicator of his overwhelming influence on the proceedings. The ways in which his description of Malvern's purpose changed between the time he issued the invitations and the assembly of the conference reflect developments in his thought which came to dominate the Conference *Findings* and became the focus of his *Christianity and the Social Order* published in 1942. The earlier statement of purpose was fairly general, referring to two broad tasks: a consideration of "fundamental facts" and the shaping of Christian thought. The later statement stressed the second of these to the exclusion of the first and it referred both to thought

31. *Ibid.*, p.2

32. *Ibid.*, p.3

33. William Temple in *Malvern 1941: The Proceedings of the Archbishop of York's Conference* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1941) p.15

and action ("work out the *principles* of Christian *living*"). Moreover, it was more specific about which fundamental facts were relevant ("the political and economic") and it presupposed a particular theological context ("natural law" and "man's destiny as a child of God"). It is interesting that in his opening address Temple suggests so much of what the Conference was eventually to conclude.

The Malvern Conference was held January 7 to 10, 1941. As Iremonger and Lloyd both note, the Conference was greatly limited by time, having but three days to cover a very broad topic.³⁴ Papers were presented by J. Middleton Murray, T.S. Eliot, Dorothy Sayers, Sir Richard Acland, Kenneth Ingram, D.M. MacKinnon, V.A. Demant, W.G. Peck, and Maurice Reckitt (whose paper was read by Temple as Reckitt was ill and could not attend). Most of these speakers represented the tradition of Christian Sociology exemplified by the Christendom Group, with which Temple had much in common.³⁵ Temple reported that this was a deliberate move in the interests of saving time and enhancing the coherence of the proceedings.³⁶ On the last day of the Conference, he presented a set of "resolutions" in which he attempted to synthesize the various papers presented. It is important to note that this document was not the result of collective deliberation by the participants. Iremonger's account of the process is revealing, despite its tendency to hagiography. He writes,

34. Cf. Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.430, and Roger Lloyd, *The Church of England, 1900-1965* (London: SCM Press, 1966) p.310

35. Cf. Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.434, and Maurice B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple: A Century of the Social Movement in the Church of England* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947) p.184

36. Roger Lloyd, *The Church of England, 1900-1965*, (London: SCM Press, 1966) p.310

... (Temple) sat down on the last night and wrote a series of "conclusions" which, he informed an astonished Conference on the next morning, expressed its "common mind". This was indeed news to the members, but never was news more welcome. They had done little in the way of conferring, but they could go home happy in the thought that they had taken part in what one of them called "a series of meetings with resolutions imposed from above."³⁷

While Temple's drafting of the Malvern document might discredit the Conference, Reckitt warns that such an objection is "superficial", given Temple's understanding of the issues and his skill in synthesizing apparently contradictory points of view. "He was ever anxious, before all, to elicit and to restate the positive truth which any man or group of men had to affirm."³⁸ As we shall see later, Temple defended the Malvern Findings as a synthesis and restatement of a body of attitudes, values, and ideas shared by the Conference participants.

His resolutions won the consent of the Conference with one notable exception: the resolution related to private ownership of industrial resources. This issue had been raised by Sir Richard Acland, M.P., whose paper had dealt with inequalities in education, health care, and the distribution of wealth. Acland said that, while the church cannot reduce itself to a political party by adopting a positive programme for the reshaping of society, the church does have a duty to speak on "the structural organization of lay society." He said,

... without making any positive judgements at all the Church should and could courageously point to those things which are wrong in our lay society, which are simultaneously a stumbling block preventing our leading Christian lives and a proof that we have not yet achieved a living Christianity. Thus the judgements of the Church about the struc-

37. Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.431

38. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple*, p.185

tural form of society must be expected to take a negative form.³⁹

Acland went on to claim that "the whole structure of our society is in flagrant disobedience to the word of God" and that "the private ownability of the major resources of our country is indeed the stumbling block making it harder for us to advance towards the Kingdom of God on earth" as it creates and fosters competition based on self interest.⁴⁰ This position caused much controversy. The Bishop of Coventry demanded that the speeches of Ingram and Acland be withheld from the press because they misrepresented the sentiments of the Conference and "equally strong counter-objections" in favour of private ownership could be made. Temple, to his credit, ruled that he had no right to interfere with the freedom of the press.⁴¹ He would appear to have forgotten this bit of controversy when he presented Acland's view of private ownership as one of his resolutions. The wording was "too emphatic to ensure general approval."⁴² Eventually an amendment was introduced and adopted. It stated that there were aspects of the life of society which "are contrary to divine justice, and act as stumbling blocks, making it harder for men to live Christian lives" and continued,

In our present situation we believe that the maintenance of that part of the structure of our society by which the ultimate ownership of the principal industrial resources of the community can be vested in the hands of private owners, *may be* such a stumbling block.⁴³

39. *Malvern 1941*, p.155

40. *Ibid.*, pp.157 and 161

41. This incident was reported in *CC*, Feb. 13, 1941, p.101

42. Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.431

43. "The Findings, Malvern" as reprinted in *CSS, Bulletin*, #103S (Feb. 25, 1945) p.2. (emphasis mine)

The replacement of "is" with "may be" was sufficient a weakening of the original to gain the unanimous consent of the Conference.

After the smoke had cleared and the dust had settled, many were left wondering what had been achieved. A great deal of material had been presented on a wide range of related topics, but there had been little opportunity for discussion and the development of ideas. Temple's resolutions had come at the end as a kind of last-ditch effort to make something of the proceedings, and so appeared to have been imposed, as we have noted. Was this the coalescing of opinion and commitment to common goals for which Temple had hoped? He evidently believed it was, and he defended the value of "The Findings" using arguments based on an interpretation of Malvern's purpose. Shortly after the Conference he explained that there were two types of conferences: those convened to explore new areas of thought, in which the value of the results depends on the thoroughness of the discussion among the participants, and those convened to make known the degree of agreement among the participants on areas of thought which have been under consideration for some time. With respect to this latter type of conference, Temple wrote,

In this case the value of the results is largely independent of the course of discussion in the conference, except so far as this elicits and makes evident a body of agreement already in existence when the conference meets, though at that stage the several members may still be unaware how far other members agree with them. The conference of Anglicans which lately met at Malvern College was of this second type.⁴⁴

To another critic he wrote,

The value of registering such an agreement as is found is that it may be used not to require assent but to challenge thought and so carry forward the general process that went on in the Conference.⁴⁵

44. William Temple, quoted in Iremonger, *William Temple*, p.428

45. *Ibid.*, p.433

From this point of view Malvern is significant. It assembled a representative body of bishops, priests, and laity⁴⁶ and registered its assent to a document reflecting the Christian Socialist tradition of which the Industrial Christian Fellowship, the Christendom Group, and Temple were contemporary exponents. Subsequently, as we shall see, the Conference prompted further reflection and action by other Anglicans.

The areas in which Malvern "registered agreement" concerned the state of society, the means of its amelioration, and the role of the church in the process. "The Findings" suggest a particular analysis of the state of Western civilization. The war was not viewed as an isolated, discrete aberration, but as symptomatic of a widespread disease caused by a loss of faith in God as the Lord of all life and a clouding of the Christian vision of personhood. The document stated that the person is created and redeemed by God for a life of eternal fellowship with him. As this view of human-ness is lost, the true end of human activity is obscured and human relations are set in disorder. Malvern considered a Christian anthropology to be "the controlling principle which allots to human activities their proper sphere and due relations to one another."⁴⁷ The particular disorder of primary concern at Malvern was the perversion of proper economic relations. The purpose of production ought to be the satisfaction of human needs and, therefore, the means of the fulfillment of human personality. However, in Western societies production had become primarily a means of profit, and thus an end in itself. "The Findings" expressed this point in the following terms:

To a large extent production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods but to bring profits to the producer; and the producer in turn is often subordinated to the purely financial ends of those who own the capital plant or supply the

46. Cf. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple*, p.183

47. CSS, *Bulletin*, #103S, p.2

credit to erect or work it.⁴⁸

This reversal of the proper relations of finance, production, and consumption was seen to be the source of domestic unemployment and international competition for markets. Noting that in Germany and, more recently, in Britian re-armament had functioned to alleviate the unemployment caused by the reversal of natural order, Malvern called the economic system "a predisposing cause of war."⁴⁹

The solution proposed by Malvern was the recovery of the lost vision of human-ness implicit in Christian faith. Through the wider acceptance of the conviction that God is Sovereign, that all persons are His children, and that through Christ we can become brothers and sisters one of another, Malvern believed a more human and just society would be created. However, Malvern also acknowledged that the church cannot seek only to convert individuals without working to change the structural and social forces which impinge on the lives of those individuals. On this point, "The Findings" quoted the Madras Conference of the International Missionary Council:

It is not enough to say that if we change the individual we will of necessity change the social order. That is a half-truth. For the social order is not entirely made up of individuals now living. It is made up of inherited attitudes which have come down from generation to generation through customs, laws, institutions, and these exist in large measure independently of individuals now living. Change those individuals and you do not necessarily change the social order unless you organize those changed individuals into collective action in wide-scale frontal attack upon those corporate evils.⁵⁰

48. *Ibid* , p.3

49. *Ibid*.

50. *Ibid.*, p.2

In the "Acland ammendment", Malvern also recognized that the corporate evils of society present a block to individual Christians as they attempt to live a life in accordance with their faith. Thus "The Findings" clearly identified a need for a change in the structure of society. The point on which agreement was not registered at Malvern was the nature or degree of this change, although all of the participants admitted the possibility that private ownership of the means of industrial production might be "contrary to divine justice." Nevertheless, in its acknowledgement of the limitations of individual conversion, Malvern was recognizing the need for structural change.

This brings us to the role of the Church. "The Findings" very carefully avoided the suggestion that the Church identify itself with particular change efforts. On the one hand, Malvern considered the church to be called to positive advocacy of Christian principles. As the Body of Christ and the means by which He carries forward His work in the world, the church has both a duty and a right to proclaim the true end of human activity. Specifically, the Church ought to proclaim that persons are children of God entitled to freedom and justice, that human personality is sacred, and that human societies ought to provide to each the opportunity for the fullest realization of this personality. Accordingly, the Church is to judge society by the extent to which it recognizes in practice these implications of a Christian anthropology. However, on the other hand, Malvern attempted to limit the extent to which the Church ought to play this role of advocacy. "The Findings" read,

There is no structural organization of society which can bring about the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, since it is a gift of God, and since all systems can be perverted by the selfishness of man. Therefore, the Church as such can never commit itself to any proposed change in the structure of society as being a self-sufficient means of salvation.

But the Church can point to those features of our existing society which, while they can never pre-

vent individual men and women from becoming Christian, are contrary to divine justice, and act as stumbling blocks, making it harder for men to live Christian lives.⁵¹

Closely related to this point is the area in which it might be said Malvern failed to register unanimity. The significance of the "Acland amendment" and the controversy surrounding it is that it indicates how far the group of Anglicans assembled at Malvern were willing to go in challenging the social infrastructure and the principle of private property. As we have already noted, the participants were able to acknowledge, perhaps as an element of sociological theory, that individuals are affected by the structure of society, but some were unable to admit that private ownership is necessarily a source of social disorder. The issue in all of this, of course, was the relationship of Christianity and socialism, an issue which had already divided groups such as the Christian Social Union. Even among those who accepted "socialism" (e.g., the Church Socialist League) there was disagreement over the kind of socialism to be striven for. Malvern as a whole, and Acland in particular, denied that any human system of itself is capable of ushering in the Kingdom. In the light of this, it was said that the Church ought to proceed *via negativa*, criticizing those elements in society which are contrary to divine justice. The rather thorny question is: how far can the Church go in criticizing the *status quo* before it appears to be endorsing a particular structural change? If the critique is made on the basis of Christian doctrine, the question becomes: to what extent can the Church advocate an alternative before it appears to be identifying that alternative with the Kingdom of God?

It was, I believe, such a rendering of the issue, with a basic fear of centralist or collectivist forms of socialism, which informed the reaction

51. *Ibid.*

against Temple's proposed condemnation of private ownership. By strongly criticizing the structural expression of the profit motive, the resolution appeared to be endorsing some form of socialism. The weaker wording was adopted to preserve some distance or objectivity.

It should be noted, by way of clarification, that this limitation was applied to the church as the Body of Christ, not to individual Churchmen, and that its intent was to guard against the identification of social change with salvation itself. It did not, therefore, restrict the church in its condemnation of the capitalist *status quo* or in its advocacy of alternative visions apparently consistent with the Christian values it is called to proclaim. Rather, Malvern sought to safeguard against the total and unequivocal identification of something like the dictatorship of the proletariat with the Kingdom of God.

One final point on which Malvern did "register agreement" was the need for reform in the life of the Church of England. "The Findings" stated that Christians cannot promote the move towards a more humane form of society (i.e., one reflecting the value of human personality) unless "they are ready to advocate and bring about a complete change in the internal financial position of the Church of England."⁵² The goal of such a radical reorganization was to better reflect the unity of purpose in the Church and to make its economic and administrative life expressive of "brotherhood". Malvern recognized that, until such reforms were made, the Church's witness would be impaired, for its work in the society as a whole would be judged by the extent to which the Church reflected Christian principles in its own life. At Malvern, the general principles of unity and "brotherhood" were declared, but the specific reforms needed to bring these values to life in the Church's financial structure were not outlined. As we shall see later, AFSA responded to Malvern's call by

52. *Ibid.*, pp.2 and 3

working for changes in the Church's economic and administrative life which would reflect the mutuality enjoined by the Gospel. Another area in which Malvern saw the need for reform was the Church's worship. Malvern believed that worship "must be so directed and conducted that its relevance to life and to men's actual needs is evident."⁵³ Here the Eucharist was stressed. "The Findings" read,

The Eucharist is to be appreciated as the offering of ourselves and all that we are -- for the bread and wine are the product of man's labour expended upon the gifts of God -- in order that Christ may present us with Himself in His perfect self-offering and that we may receive from Him the very gifts which we have offered, now charged with the divine power, to be shared by us in perfect fellowship; so in our worship we express the ideal of our common life and receive strength to make it more real.⁵⁴

The Eucharist was seen to be both a sacrament of the Lord's presence and a sacrament of the Church's unity. AFSA also promoted this view and extended it, seeing in the offering of the bread and wine a sacrament of human solidarity under God.

Malvern is important to this study, apart from its historical relationship to Temple and AFSA, as an expression of alienation. In its analysis of the decay of Western civilization, Malvern legitimized alienation as a Christian response to society. Furthermore, in acknowledging the limits of personal conversion in redeeming the situation, Malvern advocated changes in social relationships and the structure of society. In all of this, elements of a contextual method were employed. The Conference itself betrayed such a method in attempting to respond to the immediate crisis of the war and the experience of the Depression which preceded it. In its vision of the role of

53. *Ibid.*, p.4

54. *Ibid.*

the Church Malvern also pointed to a contextual method, for it saw the Church as moving between criticism of the *status quo* and proclamation and advocacy of the true relationships of persons as revealed in the Gospel. "The Findings" did not address the question of the relationship or sequence of these negative and positive roles, but it is fair to say that Malvern presents the Church's proclamation as prior to and independent of experience. Thus, it could be said that Malvern employed a contextual method in beginning with the social context, but the process was incomplete. Its conclusions were idealistic and its proclamation was rooted primarily in theological reflection, not on a fully-developed reflection on experience. This idealism is apparent in the analysis of Western civilization and in the "natural order" argument used to explain economic problems. More specifically, Malvern's was a personalist idealism, for it saw the disease of civilization to be caused by a loss of conviction concerning the Christian understanding of personhood as sacred. Malvern's response to the on-going crisis was the declaration of an ideal based on a particular rendering of "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" and a holistic or integrated vision of human relationships. This understanding of the interrelationship of persons and the corporate nature of society under God which it suggests reflects the theological orientation of both Temple and the Christendom Group. It is also quite similar to the notion of "mutuality" used by the FCSO. AFSA was inspired by such visions of personhood and society, as we shall see below. Despite all these references to Malvern's "position", it must be noted that the conference document does not present a tight, well-ordered, and systematic argument for its alienation and the alternatives which it advocates. It reflects and points to arguments and ideas better developed elsewhere, and it is to these other sources which we will refer later. Malvern's importance lies in its presentation of these ideas to a wider audience than they might otherwise have received and in a form more readily accessible to

the majority of church people. This fact is clear in the increased concern for social issues among Canadian Anglicans during the war.

Canadian Responses to the Malvern Conference

Malvern inspired an increased concern for social issues among Canadian Anglicans and prompted the official Church to make some critical pronouncements on the social order. The Conference was reported by the *Canadian Churchman* on February 13, 1941 based on an article wired to *Time* by its London correspondent.⁵⁵ In the next week's edition, the *Churchman* reprinted the Conference resolutions as well as the "Ten Points" proposed by the Anglican Archbishops, the Cardinal of Westminster, and the Moderators of the Free Churches in Britain.⁵⁶ The paper also initiated a six-part series of Lenten sermons by various contributors on "The New Social Order." This initial response was fairly positive, if occasionally pious and sentimental.⁵⁷ At least the hope for a better post-war society was shared and a need for study and critical reflection on economic and political problems was expressed by the *Churchman's* contributors.⁵⁸ Consequently, cautionary notes were sounded on the dangers of socialism and the need for "expertise". The author of "The Layman and the New Social Order" wrote,

... it would be quite wrong to think, as some do, that the Conference was only giving religious colour to 'socialism in our time'. It did not support any existing political movement or any particular scheme of economic reform. ... It laid down clearly the principles which must govern any Christian social order, but it was equally emphatic that the working out of

55. CC, (Feb. 13, 1941) p.101

56. *Ibid.*, (Feb. 20, 1941) pp.117, 118

57. See "The Parson and New Social Order," CC (March 6, 1941) p.147; "The New Order -- Humbug or Reality," CC (March 27, 1941) p.195; and "Older People and the New Social Order," CC (Feb. 27, 1941) p.131

58. The need for study was stressed by Canon S.J. Marriot in "Christ and The Church of England," CC (March 6, 1941) p.148

that order could only be done, and should only be done, by those who are expert in financial, industrial, and economic affairs.⁵⁹

In general, the *Churchman* may have been rather superficial in its treatment of Malvern. Nonetheless, it did pick up the mood of the times and presented disorder in the life of society as a legitimate area of Christian concern. Over the next two years and as the war progressed, the *Churchman* continued to publish articles in support of Christian social action. Some dealt with the history of Christian Socialism; there were two articles on F.D. Maurice⁶⁰ and another on the relationship of his group to the Chartists.⁶¹ A couple of articles dealt with events sponsored by the FCSO in support of the organization of farmers' cooperatives and the labour movement.⁶² There was also published a series of articles written by Temple shortly before his translation to Canterbury.⁶³

A more serious consideration of Malvern came from the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada. The CSS had been established by General Synod in 1915 to keep Canadian Anglicans informed of social problems and the steps being taken to remedy them.⁶⁴ Since 1918, a focus for this task had been the Council's *Bulletin*, and it was through the *Bulletin* that the CSS

59. CC (March 13, 1941) p.163

60. Nina Holland, "Pioneers of Social Service," CC (Jan. 29, 1942) p.71, and ; A.B. Lavelle, "A Prophet of Divine Excess," CC (Nov. 18, 1943) p.652

61. Nina Holland, "The Chartists and Christian Socialism," CC (April 2, 1942) p.213

62. John F. Davidson, "The Church, The Farmer and the Worker," CC (April 23, 1942) p.265, and; G.F. Partidge, "Labour and the Church," CC (Sept. 26, 1942) p.677

63. William Temple, "Freedom, Justice and Truth," CC (Feb. 5, 1942) p.84; "Justice and Faith," CC (Feb. 12, 1942) p.100; "The Dignity of Human Life," CC (Feb. 19, 1942) p.116, and; "The Spiritual Grounds of Hope," CC (March 19, 1942) p.190

64. On the CSS, see Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973) p.37 and Edward Alfred Pulker, *The Role of Anglicans in Reform of the Economic Order in Canada* (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1973) pp.75f

publicized Malvern. Under the title "Religion, Revolution and Restoration", *Bulletin* #103 described the Conference proceedings, published the original form of the resolutions, and excerpted some press reports on the Conference. A *Supplement* reprinted "The Findings" in their final, "official" form as edited by Temple and published by the Industrial Christian Fellowship. Canon W.W. Judd, General Secretary of the CSS and editor of the *Bulletin*, quite rightly perceived the importance of Malvern. He hoped that "The Findings" would become a basis for reflection among and action by groups of Canadian Anglicans. He focused on three of Malvern's very practical suggestions, encouraging his readers to "get into first-hand touch with the areas of underprivilege and delinquency" in their local communities, to remember the social implications of the Eucharist, and to "seek friendlier relations with our non-Anglo-Saxon Canadians."⁶⁵

The latter concern for the status of immigrants or war-time emigrés so dominated the CSS *Annual Report* for 1941 that only a few pages were left for a consideration of Malvern. Under the heading "Christian Sociology" the *Report* summarized Temple's letter to Oldham, the "Ten Points", and the Malvern "Findings", all of which had been published by the CSS in its *Bulletin*. The *Report* noted the interpretation of the war as symptomatic of moral disease and reiterated the hope for a new social order founded on Christian principles. It also remarked that the position adopted by Temple at Malvern rested on "a strong doctrinal foundation", taking the Christian understanding of personhood, sin, and redemption as its starting point. The basic elements of the Conference's position were outlined without comment or development, but with a call to local study, application, and action.⁶⁶ Over the next twelve months, the CSS kept

⁶⁵. CSS, *Bulletin* #103 (Feb. 23, 1941) pp.2, 3 .

⁶⁶. CSS, "A New Earth ... Wherein Dwelleth Righteousness," *26th Annual Report - 1941*, pp.24-27

Malvern (and its concerns) before its constituency by publishing a *Bulletin* entitled "Follow-Up Malvern" which reprinted an ICF pamphlet by Temple, a summary of the Conference "Findings", and a set of questions for discussion groups.⁶⁷

It was in the *Annual Report* for 1942 that the CSS published its own resolution outlining the Christian principles which should form the basis of a new social order following the war. The resolution was, in fact, a statement of the Commission of Churches in England called "An Economic Charter" to which a motion of the CSS was prefixed.⁶⁸ This preamble contained an indictment of "the structure and results of the present economic system" and affirmed the need for "a fundamental affirmation regarding the nature of man" as the basis for economic reconstruction. "An Economic Charter" contained three sections dealing with the rights of the individual, industrial relations, and the organization of the world economy. It was a concise restatement of the Malvern position.

The fact that the CSS adopted this statement is a fair indicator of the dependence of the Canadian Church on the English with respect to the approach represented by Malvern. It does not necessarily mean that the Council lacked the understanding, insight, or creativity to think for itself. Indeed, the preamble to "An Economic Charter" demonstrates that the CSS understood Malvern's criticism of the economic order and its emphasis on a Christian understanding of personhood as the basis for social reconstruction. Canon Judd's repeated calls for local reflection and action are also a sign of his understanding of Malvern's practical suggestions. The use of a British statement indicates, rather, that issues in Canada had not been considered in this way before, and that leadership was coming from the British who had a more developed analysis of the state of Western societies. However, explanations of this dependent

⁶⁷. CSS *Bulletin* #106 (Feb. 28, 1942)

⁶⁸. CSS, "The Kingdoms Are Moved!" *27th Annual Report - 1942*

relationship could also be tendered by a consideration of the colonial situation of the Church in Canada. As a colonial Church, the Church of England in Canada had a long history of dependent association with the Church of England in the "mother country" with respect to both theology and matters of practical administration. This basic relationship was certainly heightened by the war, as Canada's involvement in this primarily European conflict was a function of its relationship to England. One might also argue that the "fragment theory" of colonial societies explains why Anglicans in Canada were receptive of visions of society which were rooted in older, pre-modern ideas such as "natural law" and "just price".⁶⁹ Another factor to be considered is that the dependence of the official Church on the British statements may also be an indicator that Malvern was received, not as much as a definitive expression of the tradition of incarnational socialism, but as an isolated event and apart from the tradition of radical alienation which lay behind it.

This point should become clear as we consider Charles R. Feilding's mimeographed newsletter, *Canada and Christendom*. Feilding was Professor of Moral Theology and New Testament at Trinity College in Toronto. Between September of 1941 and January of 1942, he wrote a series of letters to some friends and former students suggesting the establishment of a newsletter similar to the *Christian Newsletter*, published by J.H. Oldham, and *Christianity and Crisis*, published by Reinhold Niebuhr.⁷⁰ This idea had grown out of the need for some means by which pastors and former students might be kept informed of new books and developments in theological studies after leaving college. Feilding recognized, however, that much of this work was already being done by various papers and journals. He hoped that something more practical might be

69. On this theory of colonial societies, see Gad Horowitz, *Canadian Labour in Politics*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968) Chap. 1, "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada," pp.3-59.

70. C.R. Feilding, mimeographed letters: Sept. 16, 1949; Oct. 28, 1941; Dec. 31, 1941; Jan. 9, 1942. (filed with *Canada and Christendom*, GSA).

produced which would focus on the relationship of the Church to social issues in Canada and on the work being done in this area by individuals and groups across the country. Specifically, he suggested a newsletter which would support the Canadian interpretation and application of the ideas developed by Malvern, the Ten Points, and by the publications of Niebuhr and Oldham. Speaking of these "creative movements" he said,

... this writing and activity is not yet directly related to the Canadian scene. For example, the problems of a northern mining town, or a prairie community, of large foreign groups, of a country in which there are "competing" churches of nearly equal strength are not really considered in the proposals set forth. The problems cannot be viewed from an academic chair in Toronto, still less from one in England; they can only be studied and dealt with by beginning on the spot. Without the pooled experience and observation of Canadian parochial leaders any "Canadian Malvern" would be talking in the air.⁷¹

A major task of Feilding's proposed newsletter would be an "indigenization" of Christian Sociology: "to bring into common focus the concrete Canadian problems and the special Christian insights given to our generation which can be related to them."⁷² He hoped that this would be done by sharing the contributions of clergy and laity from across the country. He also hoped that the newsletter would contribute to the revival of corporate spiritual life exemplified by the liturgical movement. Here as well he recognized that leadership was coming from Europe and the United States, and he emphasized the need for "Canadian" perspectives on liturgical reform.

The linking of these two concerns was not new. Malvern had noted the relationship of worship to the life of society, saying that worship, and especially the Eucharist, ought to express the ideal of common fellowship. "The Findings" had also noted that reform in current practices was needed to

⁷¹. *Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1941

⁷². *Ibid.*

make the truth of the Gospel clearer to those uninstructed in the faith.⁷³ Feilding was going beyond Malvern, however, in his identification of the movement for a Christian society with the liturgical movement. Unfortunately, this hope that liturgical change would become the second focus of *Canada and Christendom* was not realized, as the newsletter dealt almost exclusively with social concerns. Later, liturgical reform was linked with social action in AFSA. In the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, liturgical and social "revolution" were inextricably wed.

The first number of *Canada and Christendom* appeared in January, 1942. Beginning with sixty subscribers, it had over 170 by its tenth number in July, 1943,⁷⁴ and may have grown more before it ceased publication with its fifteenth number in September, 1944. Over its two and a half year history, the newsletter dealt with a number of social issues, the most important being the Church's relationship to the labour movement and advocacy of the right to collective bargaining.⁷⁵ In addition to a general consideration of the issue, *Canada and Christendom* kept its readers informed of particular disputes between labour and management and the progress being made by the strikers in gaining recognition for their organizations. Three situations were given such coverage: the miners' strike at Kirkland Lake in 1941-42;⁷⁶ the steel workers' strike in 1942-43;⁷⁷ and the textile workers' strike in Montreal in 1943.⁷⁸ Other social concerns discussed were rural life,⁷⁹ the

73. Cf. "The Findings, Malvern", *CSS Bulletin* #103S, p.4.

74. C.R. Feilding, letter of July, 1943. (filed with *Canada and Christendom*, GSA)

75. *Canada and Christendom* (GSA) #1 p.5; #2, p.3; #5, pp.4-9; #14, p.2.

76. *Ibid.*, #1, p.4; #2, p.3.

77. *Ibid.*, #7, p.6.

78. *Ibid.*, #12, p.4.

79. *Ibid.*, #2, p.4; #3, p.1; #14, p.2; #15, pp.2-4.

teaching of religion in the schools,⁸⁰ housing,⁸¹ racism and the treatment of Japanese Canadians by the Federal Government,⁸² and the effect of the war on sexual relationships.⁸³ The newsletter also printed some general articles on the relationship of the faith to the life of society and the involvement of Christians in political action.⁸⁴

Canada and Christendom saw itself as a particularly Anglican contribution to a larger ecumenical task. It was Feilding's hope that, by applying the distinctive outlook of the Anglican tradition to social problems, the newsletter might support the development of "a common front of Christian action with others" which would "set forward the work of Christian reunion."⁸⁵ This was an interpretation of Bishop Soderblom's famous maxim "service unites, but doctrine divides." With respect to objections raised by various correspondents regarding the Anglican focus of the newsletter, Feilding responded that it was appropriate for Anglicans to put their own house in order before moving to co-operate with others⁸⁶ and that this should not imply any narrowness in attitude toward other groups.⁸⁷ In the second of his letters proposing the newsletter, he said, "you must learn to ride your bicycle somewhere before you can ride it anywhere." He also believed it was "only practical" and "less confusing" to "talk in one language at a time."⁸⁸

While considering itself to be Anglican, *Canada and Christendom* did not

80. *Ibid.*, #2, p.4; #14, p.4

81. *Ibid.*, #6, p.7

82. *Ibid.*, #8, pp.1f; #12, p.3

83. *Ibid.*, #12, pp.2-6

84. *Ibid.*, #2, pp.1-2; #11, p.4; #12, p.1

85. *Ibid.*, #1, pp.1, 2

86. *Ibid.*, p.3

87. C.R. Feilding, letter of Oct. 28, 1941 (GSA) p.2

88. *Ibid.*

identify itself with the official Church in Canada. In the first number, Feilding pointed to the failure of the Church leadership to call attention to social issues such as "the rights of collective bargaining or the neglect of churches to observe just labour conditions in their building and printing, or to give a lead in the study of social medicine in rural communities." He also said that "the official reports of the C.S.S. do little more than set forth what it considers wise to say in its representative capacity," that the Council can do "only what the prevailing official opinion will tolerate."⁸⁹ In later numbers of the newsletter, the bishops were criticized for speaking only in generalities and platitudes, and for parroting the English hierarchy on social issues.⁹⁰ A 1942 pastoral letter from the Canadian bishops was dismissed as "pontifical puff."⁹¹

Canada and Christendom's criticisms were directed against the Church's failure to speak concretely to the Canadian situation. Throughout, the newsletter's emphasis was on the Canadian application of the principles and ideas already developed elsewhere. Feilding was constantly calling for contributions from readers reflecting on their local experience or sharing that experience with others.⁹² It would appear that *Canada and Christendom* only came within reach of this goal in its last number, about which Feilding said,

This issue reaches our ideal more nearly than any previous one in that it is almost entirely written by our members. I hope it will be possible to

89. *Canada and Christendom*, #1, p.2

90. *Ibid.*, #6, pp.3,5,6. See also, #8, pp.1-3; #10, p.4

91. *Ibid.*, #6, p.1

92. See *Ibid.*, #2, p.1; #3, p.4; #6, p.6; #9, p.3; #13, p.1; #14, p.3; #15, p.7

continue this method in the future.⁹³

Unfortunately, the newsletter did not continue beyond the point at which its goal was beginning to be realized, for it might have become an important support and resource to local clergy in their efforts to confront social issues within their parishes. Furthermore, it might have become a valuable resource to us, more than a quarter of a century later, in discerning the degree of critical reflection and consciousness at a more popular level. As it is, *Canada and Christendom* died in September, 1944 and re-emerged in November, 1945 as the title of a column by Charles Feilding in a new, national Church paper, *The Anglican Outlook*.

In addition to Feilding and *Canada and Christendom*. Pulker notes other individuals and unofficial groups within the Church of England in Canada which pressed for specific condemnations of the social and ecclesiastical *status quo*. The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action was one such group. Another was the group of churchmen from the Social Action Committee of the Diocese of Toronto who organized the Canadian Malvern Conference of August 1943.⁹⁴ There were also ecumenical and secular groups which supported Anglicans in their alienation, the most important of these being the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order. The FCSO heard a report on the Malvern Conference at its Annual Conference in the Spring of 1941, and it sponsored an interdenominational meeting in Toronto to consider issues similar to those which had occupied Malvern.⁹⁵ The keynote speakers at the latter meeting were Canon Judd of the CSS and Gregory Vlastos.

93. *Ibid.*, #15, p.7

94. See Pulker, p.251; and *CC* (Aug. 19, 1943) p.454

95. See *CC* (May 1, 1941) p.278; (April 10, 1941) p.233

Judd affirmed the assumption that the church was put in the world to "interfere" and, as Acland had done, he stressed that this interference must address the structure of society. Following Malvern, "he went on to brand as a modern heresy and a mere half-truth the theory that society can be effectually changed by changing the individual."⁹⁶ He also pointed to the need for a strong doctrinal basis to support Christian action in society.

It is perhaps due to the pressure exerted by unofficial groups in the Church and the support they received from the FCSO that the Second World War witnessed some moderately progressive statements on the social order by the official Church in Canada.⁹⁷ Most of these were made by the CSS. We have already noted "An Economic Charter." In 1942, the Executive of the CSS also endorsed the right to free collective bargaining and Canon Judd advocated social security as an alternative to socialism.⁹⁸ According to Pulker, "Anglican support for reform of the economic order reached its peak of public expression and commitment at the General Synod of 1943."⁹⁹ He bases this conclusion on the Synod's endorsement of social security and approval for study and action of "a statement which claimed that even more fundamental changes were necessary for the post-war economic order."¹⁰⁰ This reference to the need for change *post bellum*, however, greatly relativizes the immediate steps the Church was willing to take to change the economic order. On the whole, the

96. CC (April 10, 1941) p.233

97. See Pulker, p.262

98. On labour, see *Ibid.*, pp.277-290; on Social Security, see *Ibid.*, pp.263-276 and CSS, *Bulletin*, #108 (May 2, 1942)

99. Pulker, p.291

100. *Ibid.*, p.261. Cf. *GSJP 1943*, p.270

statements on the order of society by the official bodies of the Church of England in Canada at this time, which Pulker considers to be progressive, must be viewed within the context of the war. It is a very interesting feature of the CSS's presentation of Malvern that, in almost every *Bulletin* or *Report* dealing with the Conference, there appear either quotations from secular leaders such as Churchill or Roosevelt outlining their goals for society or very partisan references to the war. A very good example is *Bulletin* #103, which contained the initial reports on Malvern. In it, there are reprinted two excerpts from Roosevelt's famous "four freedoms" speech which he delivered to Congress on January 6, 1941, the day before the Malvern Conference convened. In this speech, the President of the United States spoke of equality of employment, opportunity, and security, the ending of special privilege, the preservation of civil liberties for all, the enjoyment of scientific progress, and a constantly rising standard of living as the basic things to be expected of a democracy. He also looked forward to a world founded upon freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.¹⁰¹ There are parallels between the hopes of Roosevelt and the hopes of Malvern. Both are framed eschatologically, looking forward to a better social and international order, and they share an egalitarian concern with respect to human freedom and dignity. The same CSS *Bulletin* reprinted an episcopal letter from the Primate, Derwyn T. Owen, in which, at the request of the Minister of Finance, he suggested ways in which the Church might support the Government in its War Saving Campaign. Under the title "To Win the War", the letter read,

Britain is fighting for her life! At such a time
our Church of England people in Canada are ready,
I know, to stand with the people of the Home Islands
in this awful conflict. The sons of our Church have
flocked to the colours. ...
Britain is fighting for her life! We must make a

¹⁰¹. CSS, *Bulletin*, #103 (Feb. 23, 1941)

supreme effort to strengthen her in that heroic struggle. We must stand with her and give to her the help she needs, in money, and in public service. Let us by prayer and repentance, by the deepening of our faith in Jesus Christ, and by the strengthening of our faith in the great imperative necessity of the Church's mission in the affairs of men, see to it that we take our right place among those who are endeavouring to hasten the day when "Thy Kingdom come on earth, as it is in Heaven."¹⁰²

It should be noted that Archbishop Owen also interpreted the war as Malvern did, as "a symptom of terrible unrest beneath the surface of life," and expressed dissatisfaction with "the state of things in the social and economic spheres which has obtained in the world for the last twenty years."¹⁰³ Nonetheless, as the quotation above indicates, the identification of the Church with the war aims of the Allies and the view of the war as a struggle for the righteousness of the Kingdom was unequivocal. Another element in this relationship of war and faith was the demand for personal sacrifice. This was expressed by Judd in the general introduction to *Bulletin* #103, where he wrote,

To win the war we must give more and more of substance and manhood and womanhood. If we have any criticism to make about our Canadian participation in the effort it is that our Governments have not conscripted all for greater and more definite and individual service.¹⁰⁴

These references to the goals of Western statesmen, the identification of the war with the struggle for righteousness, and calls for greater personal sacrifice all within the context of the Council's presentation and advocacy of the Christian sociology of Malvern, raise some questions about the function or effect of Malvern in wartime society.

This correlation may be explained in terms of the alienation felt by

102. *Ibid.*, pp.11, 12

103. *Ibid.*

104. *Ibid.*, p.3

Canadians during the war and the hope for a better world after the victory. More progressive social aims became more acceptable as the "underside" of the world economic order was more widely experienced in North America. Canon Judd acknowledged this dynamic, at least in part, when he wrote,

At last our complacency, born of Anglo-Saxon security in the last half of the century, has been breached. ... deprivation, suffering and distress have crept up from the poor, underprivileged groups to the white collar areas of life and up to the entrenched positions of privilege.¹⁰⁵

The stress of wartime production and the self-denial it demanded, the absence and death of fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers, and the identification of Canadians of Anglo-Saxon origin with the more immediate crises being confronted by their British families and friends -- and all of this on the heels of the Depression -- may have produced a more general disaffection among greater numbers who then looked for comfort in the hope that "things will be better when it's all over." Such an alienation may have released those experiencing it from their habitual tendency to accommodation and opened them to consider progressive possibilities for post-war society. It would seem that Temple was aware of this dynamic when he wrote his letter to Oldham and said that the war provided an opportunity for a great advance in the cause of social justice.

The "underside" of this greater willingness to change sinful social structures was its function as a palliative for those who were sacrificing so much for the war. From this point of view, Malvern and the pronouncements of the CSS could be seen as providing an ideological basis or support for the war effort. Faced with the need to give of oneself for the armed forces and the production of the means of war, the hope for "a new world after the war" may have helped to sustain the belief that it was somehow all worthwhile. This

¹⁰⁵. W.W. Judd, "The New World and the Church's Role," CC (Jan. 29, 1942) p.67

dynamic was at work, I believe, in "The Atlantic Charter" pronounced by Roosevelt and Churchill in August, 1941, in which they made known "certain principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world."¹⁰⁶ These eight principles included the limitation of territorial aggrandizement, the right of all people to self-determination, access on equal terms to natural resources, improved labour standards and security for all, freedom from want and fear, and global disarmament. This commitment to change constituted the war aims of the Allied leadership.

Judd recognized the similarity of the statements of the religious and secular leaderships in the Allied nations. He interpreted "The Atlantic Charter" as a commitment to a New World Order and he presented it in a CSS *Bulletin* prefaced by the demand for "an all-out war effort."¹⁰⁷ He noted with pride the resolution adopted by the Executive of the CSS, the CSS Annual Meeting of 1941, and the Executive Council of General Synod which called on the government to introduce compulsory selective service of all manpower and greater control of natural resources and productive machinery. He wrote,

Today, when the matter is an acute issue, we are glad to say that our Church adopted this statement thus early. There is in this Resolution no word of racial bias or antagonism and no reflection of party politics. These things we deplore. We can only pray that our own Church people will answer the call to sacrifice of ourselves, our sons and daughters, of our resources, profits, wages, and of our rights and group privileges for the common cause. We pray that all our Canadian peoples will be found worthy of the Cause committed to them, for it is indeed the cause of freedom and of righteousness.

.....
Against the same background of the Kingdom of Right-

¹⁰⁶. "The Atlantic Charter," reprinted in CSS, *Bulletin*, #105 (Feb. 14, 1942) Pp.7f

¹⁰⁷. *Ibid.*, p.1

teousness we place our "peace aims". We should be proud that our religious leaders abroad, and in our own country, much more in Britain, have given to the statesmen of the democratic world a lead, not merely in the general principles which should obtain in post-war society, but as well, in forward-looking, but sane, detailed suggestions that should be worked in and through the social, economic, industrial and international relations of that new world order.¹⁰⁸

This coincidence of hope for a new world and sacrifice to win the war suggests that, in advocating social change during the war, the Church actually functioned to support a tendency to accommodation. Without impugning the motives of Judd and the CSS, I would say that in its response to Malvern, the official Church in Canada merely answered the temporary openness to social change of some of its people without altering its its basic tendency to accommodation.

This analysis is supported by a consideration of the drift to the right which followed the war. Opposition to economic reform had been expressed by some churchmen during the war, but the general mood was supportive of moderate reform.¹⁰⁹ Following the Allied victory, however, this progressive atmosphere thinned and reactionary views began to be expressed more frequently and publicly. Pulker describes this development as a process of polarization in which the official Church held the line at the institution of social security and support of collective bargaining while certain unofficial "activist" groups and individuals, by continuing to press for more fundamental reform of the capitalist economy, "aroused an antagonistic reaction from the moderate and *status quo* elements within the Church."¹¹⁰ In portraying the controversy in this way, Pulker implies that the retrenchment of the official Church was "caused" by

108. *Ibid.*

109. See Pulker, pp.257f

110. *Ibid.*, p.308. On the general process of "post-war polarization", see pp.291-309

the extreme positions of the radicals, and so he fails to take into account the general mood which came to be characterized by the "Red scare" and found its worst expression in "McCarthyism".

The earlier stages of this general move against reform in the economic order and progressive thinking about society were documented by *Anglican Outlook*. In 1946, the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States was reported to be working to combat "The Findings" of the Malvern Conference.¹¹¹ Within the next year, Fulton J. Sheen was planning anti-communist broadcasts¹¹² and by 1947, the "Cold War" was generally acknowledged, dismissals from the American civil service on the basis of political opinion had begun, and anti-Russian or anti-communist propaganda was appearing in the secular press.¹¹³ As early as May, 1946, the editor of *Anglican Outlook* was aware of increased pressure to keep Christians from expressing unfavourable political opinions¹¹⁴ and in June, 1947 he began to receive letters accusing the paper of communist sympathies.¹¹⁵ While this pressure on *Anglican Outlook* came from those within the Church and particularly from businessmen, it cannot be said that this "polarization" was unique to the Church. Rather, the position of those who opposed Christians opting for social change was sustained by the general mood of the times characterized by a fear of communism and support of the *status quo*. Moreover, and this is my central point, the accommodation of

¹¹¹. AO 1,15 (June 1, 1946) p.20 (quoting an editorial in the *Toronto Star*)

¹¹². AO 2,5 (March, 1947) p.3

¹¹³. See AO 3,1 (Nov., 1947) p.10; 2,3 (Jan., 1947) p.11; 2,7 (May 1, 1946) p.9

¹¹⁴. AO 1,13 (May 1, 1946) p.9

¹¹⁵. Cf., AO 2,8 (June, 1947) p.18; 2,9 (July, 1947) pp.16, 17; 2,11 (Sept. 1947) p.16; 2,12 (Oct., 1947) p.18; 3,1 (Nov., 1947) p.17

the Church of England in Canada following the war suggests that the position advocated by Malvern was not fully assimilated and thereby lends credence to the analysis which sees in the CSS's presentation of Malvern a dominant tendency to accommodation.

While the official responses to Malvern may indicate such an ideological bias, the same cannot be said of unofficial responses such as *Canada and Christendom* and AFSA. *Canada and Christendom* rarely mentioned the war, and when it did, there were none of the calls to sacrifice and patriotic rhetoric found in the *CSS Bulletin*. Indeed, the war was only touched upon in the context of discussions of the treatment of Japanese Canadians and the impact of the war on sexual relationships.¹¹⁶ Throughout its coverage of various labour disputes between 1941 and 1943, *Canada and Christendom* focused on labour's right to collective bargaining without questioning the right to strike during a national crisis. All of this points to a greater tendency to alienation than that found in the CSS. As we shall see later, AFSA was not limited in its criticisms of capitalism by the immediate crisis of the war. In summary, it may be said that the CSS and the official Church received Malvern as an isolated event and in response to the immediate historical crisis, whereas unofficial groups, such as the readers of *Canada and Christendom* and AFSA, received the Conference as a further development in the tradition of international socialism and in the context of the tendency to radical alienation which that tradition represents.

¹¹⁶. Cf. *Canada and Christendom* #8, pp.1f; #12, pp.2-6

CHAPTER 2
AFSA's STORY

Beginnings

AFSA grew out of the progressive mood in the Church generated by the Malvern Conference. The first "official" responses to Malvern in Montreal were similar to those of the National Church. The *Montreal Churchman* did not report on Malvern, perhaps because its editor was confident that this was already being done adequately by the secular papers and the *Canadian Churchman*. The Bishop of the Diocese, Arthur Carlisle, referred to Malvern in his charge to Diocesan Synod on April 22, 1941. He commended the meeting of Churchmen, saying, "their conclusions and the course of their deliberations are worthy of respectful consideration and respectful study."¹ While he acknowledged that a few of Malvern's resolutions would be found unacceptable to some Churchmen, he nonetheless asked that Synod appoint a committee to study "The Findings" and encourage the establishment of study groups throughout the Diocese. In due course, the Bishop was requested to establish such a "committee on post-war problems".² The committee consisted of four priests and three laymen under the chairmanship of the Dean of the Cathedral, John Dixon. The Bishop did not participate.

The Committee's first report was presented to Synod in 1942. It shows an obvious dependency on the Malvern "Findings": the issues discussed, the order of their presentation, and even much of the language used were identical.³ The "Ten Points" were also quoted and endorsed. The differences between the Committee's Report and the Conference's "Findings" lay primarily in the few Canadian applications made (e.g., "conservation of our forests", "New Canadians" as opposed to wartime exiles in Britain) and in the omission of any reference

1. *SDMJP* 1941, p.24

2. *Ibid.*, p.38

3. *SDMJP* 1942, pp.88-90.

to the controversial "Acland amendment" on private ownership. The Bishop's Committee also laid less stress on the definition of principles, seeing its purpose more holistically and practically in terms of "an effort to determine how by its life, its worship, and its teaching the Church can help to interpret and translate into reality the social principles found in the Gospel of Christ."⁴ Despite these differences, the tendency to repeat the concerns and formulae of the English Church again leads one to question the degree to which the perspective of Malvern was being integrated.

The influence of Malvern can also be seen in the Report of the Committee for Social Service to the Synod of 1942. The previous Report (1941) had spoken of the work done by the Committee in petitioning the Quebec government to work towards better control and compulsory treatment of venereal diseases, and in notifying Montreal rectors of the presence of any British children evacuated to Canada and living within their parishes. The 1941 Report had also contained expressions of concern about juvenile delinquency, future veterans, and liquor control. It had ended with a vague reference to the war which read,

Your committee draws attention to the need for a full understanding of our Christian duty in international affairs, and specifically of the obligation to think and act in those terms of common fellowship and common care which, after past failures, we have now accepted as our reason for going to war. The Committee hopes that serious study groups will be promoted and guided in order that a reasoned faith may continuously support us through to victory, and may increase in us the wisdom without which no true and lasting peace can be made.⁵

By the Synod of 1942 the mood of the Committee for Social Service had changed. This is most evident in the motion to create a Diocesan Council for Social Service (DCSS), an action which formalized and legitimized social concern by

⁴. *Ibid.*, p.4

⁵. *SDMJP 1941*, p.95

placing it in the hands of a permanent body.⁶ While the actual Report of the Committee for that year dealt with issues similar to those mentioned a year earlier (child abuse, compulsory education, penal institutions, temperance, motion pictures), the rationale for the DCSS betrayed the influence of Malvern and Temple. For instance, the proposal read:

It is necessary for the Church to speak clearly, fearlessly and honestly on a Social Order which likes to call itself Christian. Clearly such a society cannot be run on principles that contradict the Christian faith, and still call itself Christian.⁷

Here we see an implicit understanding of the need to become critical of the inner principles of social organization. The tasks of the proposed Council also reflected Malvern's call to study and local action: the Council would study local conditions in the social, industrial, and cultural spheres with a view to influencing opinion, both in the Church and in society, and directing that opinion "towards the correction of wrong conditions and the setting up of proper and just conditions of living."⁸

The Reports of the Bishop's Committee and the Social Service Committee delivered to Synod in 1942 were the first signs of Malvern's influence in the Diocese of Montreal.⁹ Just before Synod met that year, the movement for social justice had received an important boost. On March 31, 1942, Cosmo Lang had retired as Archbishop of Canterbury and William Temple was translated from York to the primatial see. His enthronement in the seat of St. Augustine took place on St. George's Day, April 23, 1942. Temple's views on social issues

6. *SDMJP* 1942, p.34

7. *Ibid.*, p.99

8. *Ibid.*

9. As the Social Service Committee's Report for 1941 was dated February 28 and the Malvern document was not published by the *Canadian Churchman* and the CSS before February 20 and 25, respectively, it is not surprising that Malvern's influence was not apparent until 1942

were by this time very well-known, not only because of his ecumenical involvements and his chairmanship at Malvern, but especially because of the appearance earlier in 1942 of his little book *Christianity and Social Order*. The book sold so well that, by May, 1942, a reprint was needed, only to be followed by another in August of the same year.¹⁰ In the year between the Synod of 1942 and 1943, there appeared within the Diocese of Montreal several indicators of the influence of Temple and Malvern. In September of 1942, the "sociology group" at the Church of St. John the Evangelist began its fourth winter of activity with a series of studies related to Temple's new book.¹¹ Similar events dealing with issues related to a Christian social order were held in the parishes of St. Columba, St. Aidan, and St. Clement.¹² Even the West-mount parish of St. Matthias had a "social service group".¹³ During Advent, 1943, a series of sermons at Christ Church Cathedral focused on the ten point programme advocated by the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems.¹⁴ This series was, no doubt, initiated by the Dean, John Dixon, who was chairman of the Bishop's Committee and, at this time, perceived to be a disciple of Temple. His affinity to Temple had been apparent in his address to the 1942 Convocation of Montreal Diocesan Theological College, in which he expounded his view of Christian duty in society.¹⁵ He had also expressed progressive views in an address on "The Church's Right to Speak" delivered to a conference of clergy and laity sponsored by the Bishop's Committee and titled "Christianity or

10. Edward Heath, in a "Foreward" to William Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, (London: Shephard-Walwyn, SPCK, 1976) p.5

11. *Montreal Churchman* (April 1943) p.17

12. *SDMJP* 1943, p.112

13. *CC* (Feb. 12, 1942) p.108

14. Cooper, *Blessed Communion*, p.199

15. *Montreal Churchman*, (June, 1942) pp.4-5

Chaos."¹⁶ Thus it was that social concern was highlighted in the Diocese of Montreal. If one can gauge the level of interest in a Christian approach to social issues by the size of the Social Service Committee, then it is significant that the membership of the Committee grew from about 30 men in the years before the Malvern Conference to 54 in 1941-42, 50 in 1942-43, and 68 in 1943-44.

Malvern's point of view was promoted within the Diocese by individual members of Synod and its committees. While it may be somewhat tendentious to say that those who later became AFSA members were the decisive influence on the Social Service Committee, it is fair to assume that those who declared themselves to be progressive late in 1944 were already leaning in that direction two or three years earlier. With respect to "Flynn" Flanagan and Sam Pollard, this was certainly the case, as both had been members of the FCSO since before the war. Early in 1942, Flanagan became the chairman of the Social Service Committee and it was under his leadership that the DCSS was conceived and proposed. In addition to Sam Pollard, the other future AFSA members on the Committee in 1941-42 were E.S. Reed, Ken Brueton, John Kirby, and John Peacock. In 1942, Percy Powles and M.A. Stephens joined the Committee, and in 1943, Roland Bodger and Ray Corbett also joined. Flanagan, a dentist, and Corbett, an insurance agent, were the only laymen among the "ginger group" at this time. "Flynn" Flanagan had also been a member of the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems from its creation in 1941. Ernie Reed and M.A. Stephens joined him on that committee in 1942. There were also at this time, other progressive members of Synod who were very supportive of Malvern and Temple, although they never become AFSA members. The most notable among these, besides Dean John Dixon, was Canon W.H. Dawson, rector of the Anglo-Catholic parish of St. John the Evangelist, who served on the Bishop's Committee from 1941.

16. *Ibid.*, (Feb. 1943) p.7; (March 1943) pp.8-9; (April 1943) pp.8-12

On January 5, 1943, Bishop Arthur Carlisle died. A new diocesan bishop was to be elected by Synod in March. Some of the more progressive members of Synod, such as Flanagan and Pollard, decided to support Dixon's candidacy for the episcopacy because of the attitudes and values he had been expounding. A critical factor in their decision to opt for the Dean had been the address he delivered at the conference "Christianity or Chaos", just three weeks after Carlisle's death. Dixon was elected bishop on March 2 and was enthroned on the first day of Diocesan Synod, May 3, 1943.¹⁷

The Synod of 1943 began its debates in the wake of these three significant developments in diocesan life: the point of view represented by Malvern had been disseminated and reflected upon; a new bishop with apparently pro-Temple leanings had been elected; and, most important in terms of the growth of AFSA, several progressive priests and one or two laymen had begun to work together on the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems and the Social Service Committee. These factors, especially the latter, influenced the 1943 Reports of the two committees. The Bishop's Committee pointed to the restatement of Christian principles found in its previous Report and proposed several organizational changes which would ensure continued reflection and action on the principles declared. Among these were the changing of the Committee's name to "The Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order", the organization of a follow-up conference to "Christianity or Chaos", close co-operation with the educational and social service programmes of the diocese to initiate and promote study groups, and the establishment of a "Board of Information" to propagate the faith and its application to "everyday human affairs."¹⁸

17. *SDMJP 1943* pp.22 & 35f

18. *Ibid.*, pp.112-113

The Bishop's Committee also advocated ecumenical co-operation "for an effectual proclamation of the Social Implications of the Gospel."¹⁹ The Report of the Social Service Committee for 1943 also proposed organizational reforms which would serve to promote study of and action on social issues by the Church. For instance, a full-time secretary was requested to oversee the establishment of study groups throughout the diocese. Co-operation with other communions was also urged.²⁰

The Reports of the two Committees differed in one important respect. The Social Service Committee was obviously critical of the Church and society, identifying those areas of the ecclesiastical and secular order which were not in accordance with Christian principles. It claimed that the economic structure of the Church was not based on Christian fellowship and the equality of each in the eyes of God. They expressed the principle of equality thus: "from each congregation and individual according to their ability to give and to each according to their need."²¹ In order better to approximate the ideal, the Committee urged the adoption of one basic clerical stipend with allowances. By such a scheme, all priests and deacons would receive salaries based on the same scale, with incremental increases according to years of service, the number of family members being supported, and the amount of travel required to care for the parish. The purpose of the plan was an equalization of salaries, so that rectors in poorer rural parishes would receive stipends approximately equal to those received by rectors of large urban parishes. The Committee's motion was debated at length and the discussion was resolved when an amendment endorsing the principle of the basic stipend and establishing a

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*, p.100

21. *Ibid.*, p.101

committee to explore ways and means was introduced and passed. The bishop was asked to appoint the committee and the Synod was asked to report to General Synod regarding the proposed plan.²²

In addition to the resolution on basic stipend, the Social Service Committee moved that, in order to secure a wider representation of the church at Synod and on its committees, the Executive Committee of Diocesan Synod make possible the payment of expenses incurred by both clerical and lay delegates to Diocesan, Provincial, and General Synods. The significance of this motion was its implicit attack on what some AFSA members have called the "rotten borough" system by which smaller, rural parishes were represented at Synod by businessmen and lawyers who had summer homes in the country. As each delegate was responsible for his own accommodation and meals while attending Synod in Montreal, it appeared to be simply convenient that those with homes in the city should represent their summer-time churches at Synod. The result was that farmers and workers in rural areas were not able to represent themselves and their interests at Synod, while the business community was, in a sense, over-represented. This resolution was adopted.²³

These resolutions on basic stipend and the payment of Synod delegates' expenses represent the first public appearance of issues around which AFSA organized itself. Although the group did not emerge as such until the spring of 1944, it is apparent that a group of progressive churchmen had already begun to work together by the Synod of 1943 and before the first Arundel Conference held in August of that year. This fact is supported by others.

²². *Ibid.*, p.45

²³. *Ibid.*

In an interview, Flanagan referred to a group of progressive clergy and laymen who had supported Dixon in the episcopal election of March, 1943.²⁴ In *Canada and Christendom* #10 (July, 1943) Charles Feilding discussed a letter received from a Montreal correspondent who spoke of a "group of younger clergy who have been thinking along radical lines for some time."²⁵ Part of the letter quoted by Feilding read,:

We have an informal nucleus of young men who believe in this "root and branch" reform. We meet together and discuss things very freely once in awhile and out of this freedom springs many things and especially the determination to act; but no resolution finding! and no minutes!²⁶

This group was clearly linked with Synod's resolution on basic stipend. The letter also referred to "an unofficial clergy group called the Society of Mutual Help" which met monthly. During the winter, the group occasionally involved "three fine young laymen" and they met together "to talk over policy and strategy" in relation to Synod.²⁷ From Feilding's comments it would appear that the group considered a strategy based on working within the official structure of the Church to be more effective than "wasting effort on new and unofficial organizations."²⁸

24. Interview with Dr. J.C. "Flynn" Flanagan, at his home in Arundel, Quebec (August 5, 1980)

25. *Canada and Christendom*, #10, p.3

26. *Ibid.*

27. This may be the same group referred to in the following announcement printed in *CC*, (Feb. 5, 1942) p.94: "The Clergy Mutual-Help was entertained by the ladies of St. Thomas' Church on Monday, January 12th. A paper on 'Clergy Pooling of Salaries in Japan' was read." No doubt the paper had been prepared by Percy Powles, who had been in Japan from 1916 to 1941

28. *Canada and Christendom* #10, p.3. It is unfortunate that Feilding's correspondent is unnamed. It could have been Sam Pollard, as he received *Canada and Christendom* from the start (interview with Sam Pollard at McGill University, Montreal, August 6, 1980.)

Organization

The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action grew out of this "informal nucleus" between the Synods of 1943 and 1945. On May 1 to 3, 1943, the FCSO sponsored a conference in Montreal titled "Toward a Christian Society".²⁹ The main speaker was Joseph Fletcher, who at that time was Dean of the Graduate School of Applied Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio, and an associate editor of *The Witness*, *Christendom* (U.S.) and the *Anglican Theological Review*. He delivered two talks dealing with "The Duty of the Church to speak" and an "Analysis of Social Forces." The conference participants were mostly labour unionists, academics, and members of the FCSO and the CCF. The workshops were to deal with "Growing Forces in Rural Society", "Struggle for Industrial Democracy", "Training Youth for a Christian Society" and "Necessity for an Adequate School System". Sam Pollard, who was to be one of the discussion group leaders, and Ernie Reed convinced Flynn Flanagan that he should attend the conference to hear Fletcher. After the conference, Reed and Pollard thought it would be a good idea to invite Fletcher to return to Montreal to address a group of Anglicans. Flynn offered the use of his home on Bevan's Lake, near Arundel in the Laurentians, for such a meeting and the first of several Arundel Conferences was held in August, 1943.³⁰ The Conference was attended, at least in part, by Bishop Dixon, 21 clergy, and three laymen. The majority of the participants sat on the Social Service Committee of the Diocese. Twelve of those present later became members of AFSA: Percy Powles, Cyril Powles, Roland Bodger, Ken Brueton, John Kirby, John Peacock, Sam Pollard, Ernie Reed, M.A. Stephens, Ray Corbett, D.B. Harrison, and Flynn Flanagan.

29. *Montreal Churchman* (May, 1943) p.5

30. The first Arundel Conference was reported in the *Montreal Churchman* (October, 1943) pp.15-16; (November, 1943) pp.27-28; (December, 1943) pp.20-21

Fletcher spoke about the church's right to speak on political and economic issues, Temple's goals for social reconstruction, Christian Sociology, the Christian understanding of human-ness and its implications for politics, and some of the Church's social teachings in the past regarding property, work, just price, and profit. In his lectures, as reported in the *Montreal Churchman*,³¹ the influence of the point of view developed by Temple in *Christianity and Social Order* is evident. This is true, not so much of the detail of Fletcher's argument, but in his general approach. As did Temple, Fletcher stressed the social nature of personhood; he used "natural law" to condemn excessive profits, and he referred to the social teachings of the pre-modern Church. It is significant that this was the point of view presented at the first Arundel Conference, as it was the Temple-Fletcher "line" which became the mainstream in AFSA's thought and action.

A different, but complementary point of view was presented at the second Arundel Conference in August of 1944. The speaker that year, invited on Fletcher's recommendation, was Frederick Hastings Smyth, the founder and superior of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth (SCC) at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Smyth was the son of a wealthy family, well-established in the Hudson Valley.³² He was a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in chemistry and, during the First World War, he had served as a captain in the Chemical Warfare

31. *Ibid.*

32. Unless otherwise noted, information on Frederick Hastings Smyth and the SCC was shared by Cyril Powles in an interview at Trinity College, Toronto, March 2, 1981. See also *Montreal Churchman* (August, 1944) p.4

Department of the United States Army. After five years in research following the war, Smyth went to Europe where he became associated with various left-leaning artists and writers. He studied for the priesthood in Rome and was ordained in Malta in 1931. The report of the second Arundel Conference in the *Montreal Churchman* described the SCC as "a society within the Anglican Communion whose primary purpose is, under God, to bear intensive witness to the Incarnational, Sacramental and therefore Social essence of the Christian religion."³³ It apparently saw itself as a group dedicated to liturgical and social revolution.³⁴ Smyth's theme at the Conference was "The Church as the Organ of Social Redemption" and he covered five basic areas: the Incarnation of the Word in Jesus; the church as the transformed society by which the whole social order is transformed; the concept of "metacosmesis" or "transordering"; the offertory at the Eucharist and liturgical reform; and the need for structural changes in the existing order. These elements of Smyth's thought can be found in his books *Manhood into God* and *Discerning the Lord's Body*.³⁵ While AFSA never adopted a theology as systematic as Smyth's some of his significant ideas were adopted, particularly his emphasis on the offertory and his understanding of the role of the church in the world. The SCC influence became the "radical Anglo-Catholic" and secondary stream of AFSA's thought and action.³⁶

The earliest record of AFSA is a "suggested reading list for A.F.S.A. members"

33. *Montreal Churchman* (October, 1944) p.17

34. The SCC was described in these terms by Vince Goring, in an interview in his home in Toronto, July 23, 1980

35. Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Manhood into God* (New York: Round Table Press, 1940) and *Discerning the Lord's Body: The Rationale of a Catholic Democracy* (Louisville, Ky: The Cloister Press, 1946)

36. On the relationship of AFSA and the SCC, see below, pp.89-94 and 155-157.

dated May 1944. Some of the publications recommended were *The Christian News-Letter*, *Christendom*, *The Social Christian* (Journal of the Socialist Christian League in Britian), *Christianity and Crisis*, and *The Malvern Torch* (published by the Industrial Christian Fellowship).³⁷ The earliest copy of the group's "Principles and Rules" is a typescript filed with the final announcement of the 1944 Arundel Conference in the papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.³⁸ This suggests that AFSA developed its Principles and Rules about the time of the second Arundel Conference. It was not until later in that year that the group took on a public profile. On Novemeber 4, 1944, the Montreal Gazette published a letter which protested against the inadequate coverage given the death of William Temple on October 26. The letter was signed by ten priests and two laymen who identified themselves as the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action.³⁹ In December, 1944, an editorial in the *Montreal Churchman* mentioned an "Arundel group" and described the "informal gatherings" at the Flanagans as "a clearing house for ideas on religious questions and an encouragement for Christian Social Action."⁴⁰ The editorial also said that this group had been "already named from the public platform."⁴¹ Before Synod of 1945, AFSA

37. "Suggested reading list - for A.F.S.A. members. May 1944." Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth. (author unknown)

38. "The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action" and "The Arundel Conference, August 21-25, 1944. Final Notice." Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

39. Reprinted in *AO* 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.2.

40. *Montreal Churchman* (Dec. 1944) p.7.

41. *Ibid.*

emerged with a "Manifesto" announcing its principles and rules.⁴² The twelve charter members listed in the Manifesto were those who had signed the letter to the Gazette: Rev. W.J. Bishop; Rev. R. Bodger; Rev. K.N. Brueton; Mr C.J. Champion; Dr. J.C. Flanagan; Rev. J.C. Kirby; Rev. J.O. Peacock; Rev. S.L. Pollard; Rev. C.H. Powles; Rev. P.S.C. Powles; Rev. E.S. Reed, and; Rev. M.A. Stephens.

"On the cover of the Manifesto, AFSA described itself as "an unofficial group of clergy and layfolk pledged to advocacy of Christian social principles." In the body of the Manifesto, four principles were proclaimed. The first of these read:

1. We believe that the Church ought to proclaim that it is God's Will that men should live together on this earth in brotherhood, holding the natural resources of the earth as a common trust for all mankind.

The two imperatives in this statement relate to the dual focus of AFSA's work: the Church and the world. The group's concern with the Church related to its teaching (what the Church "ought to proclaim") and to its exemplary witness in the world. This role was developed in the fourth principle, which

42. The "Principles and Rules" were reprinted in an editorial in the *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1945) p.7. There are two copies of the "Manifesto" in the papers of C.H. Powles. One lists 12 "Charter Members of the Fellowship", therefore it is likely it was published in the winter of 1944-45. The second lists 24 members. Pulker (p.251, n.52) dates the same list in 1946 without explaining why. An "earlier" copy can also be found in the papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

The document carries no name or title except that of the Fellowship. However, I use the term "Manifesto" advisedly, as the AFSA members interviewed referred to it as such. This term may have been coined by the *Montreal Churchman*, which referred to the "Principles and Rules" as AFSA's "inaugural manifesto" (op. cit.).

All these copies of the "Principles and Rules", including that referred to in n.38, above, are identical. In *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action* (papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth) there are two minor changes: a note appended to Rule 6 and a change in Rule 7 (See below, p.75 and p.72, respectively). Internal evidence suggests that this document dates from 1947 or later.

read:

4. We recognize the need for church reform voiced in the following resolution passed by the 308 archbishops and bishops of the Anglican Communion throughout the world at the Lambeth Conference in 1930: that "if the Church is to witness without reproach for justice and brotherhood in the world, it must show itself serious and insistent in reforming abuses within its own organization, and in promoting brotherhood among its own members."

AFSA's concern with the world was developed in the second and third principles, which read:

2. We affirm that our present economic system frustrates brotherhood, as its appeal is primarily to self-interest and its basis is competition: therefore this system is unchristian and immoral.

3. We maintain that the present social order cannot be changed without a change in heart and mind and will in the individual, and a corresponding change in the political and industrial arrangements.

These principles reflect the Malvern "Findings". The emphasis on brotherhood as God's will parallels Malvern's focusing on the status of persons as children of God. Malvern also identified the need for reform in the economic and administrative life of the Church and the necessity of both personal and systemic transformation in society. Furthermore, Malvern and Temple were also critical of capitalism's denial of human fellowship, although Malvern was not as explicit as was the AFSA Manifesto. On the other hand, the AFSA Manifesto represents something more than selective restatement of the positions developed by Malvern and Temple. The particular ways in which AFSA acted upon its values sets it apart from its British antecedents and from other Canadian groups. For instance, the commitment to collectivism implied in AFSA's first principle and the alienation from a competitive and individualistic economic system explicit in principle two led AFSA to identify itself, or to allow itself to be identified with, other groups, movements, or causes which posed a threat to the *status quo* in North America following the Second World War. These included not only the labour movement, but

resistance to the suppression of civil liberties by the Duplessis regime in Quebec, to the Western support of Chiang Kai Shek, and to the American intervention in Korea. Similarly, with respect to AFSA's commitment to change in the life of the Church, the group advocated adoption of one basic clerical stipend with allowances, increased "democratization" of church government, and liturgical reform. While elements of the above may be found in other groups or movements, this particular blend sets AFSA apart as a Canadian expression of an incarnational socialism.

Some of AFSA's specific concerns were expressed in the seven Rules printed in the Manifesto, which read,

We pledge ourselves:

1. To bear together the burdens involved in the advocacy of these principles.
2. To meet at regular intervals for Holy Communion and discussion
3. To read at least one book on social problems each month.
4. To produce and distribute literature in support of our principles and to advocate them publicly.
5. To work for a system of clerical stipends based upon the Christian doctrine of brotherhood.
6. To co-operate with other groups, religious and secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness.
7. To pay a minimum membership fee of two dollars a year.

Membership in AFSA consisted in acceptance of and commitment to these Principles and Rules, although this appears to have become formalized and diversified as the group grew. The By-Laws identified a four-step process in the admission of members which led to an "initiation" according to the form developed for use by the Montreal Unit in 1947.⁴³ The By-Laws also provided for an Associate Membership for those who accepted the Principles

⁴³. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.5

and Rules but could not participate in the discipline of income sharing.⁴⁴

Associates had all the rights and privileges of Full Members, but they could not hold office in the Fellowship.

The AFSA members met once a month to pray, study, and strategize. Attendance at these meetings was considered very important. The By-Laws state that,

The meeting of the Unit shall have the first priority on the member's time. Members who unavoidably must be absent must notify the secretary in advance and give the reason. Any member absent from two meetings in succession without a reason acceptable to the Unit will be asked to resign.⁴⁵

Each meeting began with a Eucharist. AFSA received the permission of Bishop Dixon to use its own liturgy⁴⁶ and, perhaps as early as 1946, the group had a liturgical committee which attempted to develop a socially responsible eucharistic liturgy based on ancient practice.⁴⁷ Following the liturgy, there was a short business meeting to deal with matters relating to finances, membership, and the Arundel Conferences, followed by discussion. The By-Laws refer to minutes of the meetings, but I have not been able to locate copies of these records.

The Manifesto and By-Laws give us some idea of the structure of the AFSA organization. The original copy of the Manifesto identified three executive

44. *Ibid.* On income sharing, see below pp.71f.

45. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* p.6

46. Interview with J.C. Kirby at McGill University, Montreal, August 6, 1980.

47. See E. Cecil Royle, "To the Liturgical Committee of AFSA: A Proposed Order of Holy Communion," n.d., papers of C.H. Powles. Royle put "Hudson Heights" under his name. Hudson Heights is in the Parish of Vaudreuil, where Royle worked from 1946. His name is also on the later, "1946" copy of the "Manifesto".

officers: a President (J.C. Kirby), a Vice-President (C.J. Champion), and a Secretary (M.A. Stephens). According to Vince Goring, who joined AFSA in 1947, these positions existed, but they were not considered very important.⁴⁸ Elected officers are alluded to in the By-Laws, but it is not clear what positions existed. The By-Laws are more concerned with the national structure of AFSA. Priests from outside the Diocese of Montreal attended the second Arundel Conference and, by the middle of 1945, AFSA was attracting attention farther afield.⁴⁹ By the fall of 1946 there were AFSA Units in the Dioceses of Montreal, Toronto, Nova Scotia, and Newark, New Jersey.⁵⁰ These groups were joined together by common acceptance of the Principles and Rules. Organizationally, they were related through a liason committee which met at least twice a year and was composed of one member from each of the Units. The responsibilities of this committee, as described by the By-Laws, were to "see that the principles and rules of the Fellowship are upheld by all units" and to "act as a clearing house for problems, projects, and ideas affecting the Fellowship as a whole."⁵¹

In addition to the monthly meetings, a major focus of the life of the group was the annual Arundel Conference. The documentation suggests that there were

48. Interview with Vince Goring.

49. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, July 10, 1945. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth

50. "Anglican Fellowship for Social Action at the Oratory," *Bulletin of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth*, II,5 (Twentieth Sunday After Pentecost, 1946, Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ the King) p.2

51. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.6

at least ten Conferences between 1943 and 1955.⁵² They offered the members of the Fellowship a valuable opportunity to reflect together, to sharpen their analysis of the situation, and to develop new theological images and understandings with which to support their common effort. The Conferences also allowed AFSA to build relationships with those outside the Diocese of Montreal, as Arundel attracted sympathetic individuals from Nova Scotia, Ontario, and the Eastern United States.

It is typical of AFSA that all those attending Arundel paid the same fee for registration, accommodation, and transportation, regardless of the distance travelled. This way, those farther away were not discouraged from participating as those within the Diocese subsidized them. As the group developed, this kind of voluntary sharing of resources became more important. In the earlier version of the Rules, members were required to pay a membership fee of

52. On Arundel 1943 (led by Joseph Fletcher) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (Oct. 1943) pp.15f; (Nov. 1943) pp.27f; (Dec. 1943) pp.20F.

On Arundel 1944 (led by Frederick Hastings Smyth) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (Aug. 1944) p.4; (Oct. 1944) pp.17f; (Nov. 1944) pp.9f; "The Arundel Conference August 21-25, 1944," Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1945 (led by Gordon C. Graham of Brooklyn, N.Y.) see: *CC* (Sept. 20, 1945) p.4; *Montreal Churchman*. (July 1945) p.20; (Aug. 1945) p.23; (Oct. 1945) pp.8f.

On Arundel 1946 (led by Gilbert Cope of Coventry, England) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (April 1946) p.25; (Aug. 1946) p.4; (Nov. 1946) pp.23f; *AO* 1,2 (Oct. 1946) p.6; "The Arundel Conference, August 19-23, 1946) Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1947 (led by Frederick Hastings Smyth) see: *AO* 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.4; "The Arundel Conference, August 18-22, 1947," Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1948 (led by Joseph Fletcher) see: *AO* 3,10 (Aug. 1948) p.8; "The Arundel Conference" (announcement of the 1948 Conference), Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1951 (led by Leslie Hunter, Lord Bishop of Sheffield, England) see: *AO* 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.2 and 7,2 (Dec. 1951) pp.13f.

On Arundel 1953 (led by C.E. Raven) see: *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.3. This report says the Arundel Conference had been held "almost annually for the past decade."

In addition to these eight, two other guest speakers at Arundel Conferences are mentioned: William H. Melish and Alastair McKinnon (*AO* 11,1 [Nov. 1955] p.10). The same article claims that the Conferences were held "each August".

two dollars a year.⁵³ By the time *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* was published, members were required to "pay a graded levy as made by the Fellowship."⁵⁴ This levy was part of an income equalization scheme in which all contributed to a common fund out of which poorer members' incomes were supplemented.⁵⁵ The increased importance of this discipline among AFSA members is underscored by the quotation from the Acts of the Apostles on the cover of *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*: "They had all things in common....and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need". (Acts 2:44,45). This sharing in AFSA was, no doubt, inspired by the Iona Community in Scotland, the members of which pooled their resources and received stipends equal to the national average income.⁵⁶

The monthly meetings and annual conferences constituted AFSA's re-creation. They were the means by which the members of the groups were strengthened to "take on" others in the advocacy of their point of view. In the next section I will discuss the various ways in which AFSA attempted to realize its principles and rules in society and in the Church.

Ways and Means: Social Action

There were three broad social issues which engaged the members of AFSA: labour and the right to collective bargaining; the suppression of civil liberties by the Duplessis regime, and; international relations in the context of the Cold War. In these issues, AFSA members worked with others. This was in

53. "Manifesto", Rule 7.

54. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.2.

55. Interview with Cyril Powles

56. AO 2,5 (March 1947) p.9 and 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.6.

accordance with the rule stated in the Manifesto: "To co-operate with other groups, religious or secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness."

AFSA's concern for labour was reflected in two of the "Christian Axioms" proposed in the AFSA pamphlet, "*A Christian Economic System*."⁵⁷ These were:

3. Every person is entitled to a living according to his need and must bear his full share of responsibility according to his ability.
5. Undemocratic regimentation of people for any reason is prohibited and no person may be exploited or wasted in the interests of commerce, industry, trade or the professions.

In the Valleyfield textile workers' strike of 1946, some AFSA members were involved in a Citizen's Committee which protested the use of the provincial police in breaking the strike.⁵⁸ This Committee also sponsored an attempt to deliver food to the strikers' families which was aborted by the police.⁵⁹ Working conditions and salaries in textile mills were still an issue for AFSA members in 1950.⁶⁰ Some members supported the famous Asbestos strike of 1949 by joining the picket line.⁶¹ Here, again, the police were used in union busting.⁶² In addition to action in support of specific strikes, *Anglican Outlook* regularly featured the labour movement in its September issue with articles by labour leaders and editorials on the church's relationship to working people.⁶³

57. John Peacock, *A Christian Economic System* (also known as "AFSA Bulletin #1"), n.d., 4pp. Papers of C.H. Powles.

58. Several AFSA members signed a letter to the editor of the *Montreal Standard* protesting Duplessis' arresting of union officials. See "Duplessis Action is Protested," *Montreal Standard* (January 18, 1947.)

59. See Arthur Elcombe and Cyril and Marjorie Powles, "The Quebec Textile Dispute," AO 2,1 (Nov. 1946) pp.14f.

60. See Don Heap, "New Textile Pay Contract Needed," AO 5,11 (Sept. 1950) p.13.

61. Interview with Vince Goring and Flynn Flanagan.

62. See AO 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6; 4,9 (July, 1949).

63. See, e.g. AO 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.12f. and 11,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1956) pp.7f.

The issue of abuses of human rights by the Quebec government under Duplessis was also addressed through articles and editorials in *Anglican Outlook*.⁶⁴ In addition to the use of the police in strike-breaking, AFSA protested the harassment of minority religious groups, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Baptists, and Jews, and the notorious Padlock Law by which the Attorney General of the Province (who also happened to be the Premier, Duplessis) was empowered to padlock for up to one year any premises suspected of being used for the promulgation of "communism" or "bolshevism". The law allowed for action without trial and it did not define "to propagate communism or bolshevism." AFSA members participated with other groups in numerous protests against the Duplessis government and Flynn Flanagan acted as a trustee of a fund to support a test case against the law.⁶⁵ The religious leadership of the major Protestant denominations soon realized that, if smaller non-Roman Catholic groups were being suppressed by the police and were becoming the victims of red-baiting, they might be next. This was also AFSA's concern, as the Fellowship was perhaps more vulnerable than other groups within the Churches. AFSA was particularly concerned that the Padlock Law would begin to be used against pacifists and pro-Russian speakers such as Hewlett Johnson, the "Red Dean" of Canterbury.⁶⁶ In the general atmosphere of anti-Communism which accompanied the first stages of the Cold War, AFSA took a dangerous prophetic stance in denouncing the "Red scare" and American foreign policy as the preparations for another world war. Through *Anglican Outlook*,

64. See Cyril and Marjorie Powles, "The Civil Liberties -- of Others," *AO* 2,10 (Aug. 1947) p.12; Roland Bodger, "The Right to Speak -- in Quebec," *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.12; also, *AO* 4,7 (May, 1949) p.7; 5,7 (May, 1950) p.4; 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.5; 11,4 (Feb. 1956) p.3

65. See *AO* 5,7 (May, 1956) p.4; 11,4 (Feb. 1956) p.3

66. See *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.12.

AFSA criticized the ideological biases of the secular and Church papers in their coverage of the Chinese Revolution and it denounced the regime of Chiang Kai Shek as repressive of human rights.

In taking these stands, AFSA left itself open to charges of "communism". AFSA did co-operate with communists. The Fellowship was committed to working with others to achieve social change, as stated in Rule 6 of the Manifesto: "to co-operate with other groups, religious and secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness." However, the danger existed that AFSA would become too closely identified with the organizations with which it worked, such as labour unions, the CCF, and the Communist Party. A note appended to Rule 6 in *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* re-emphasized AFSA's co-operation with others as strategic and based in a common commitment to a particular goal. It reminded members that,

... when any particular issue in social righteousness has been settled to the satisfaction of the Unit concerned, then that co-operation is at an end. The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action is not a means of furthering the ends of any other group as such. Its sole purpose is to work for the extension of God's Kingdom in Christian Fellowship.⁶⁷

In fact, it would have been impossible for AFSA as a whole to support any one group wholeheartedly. The AFSA members belonged to a variety of progressive organizations representing different, sometimes incompatible, political opinions.

Ways and Means: Church Reform

Although action in secular society was an integral part of AFSA's work, the greater part of the Fellowship's energies were devoted to the advocacy of its principles within the Church. Diocesan Synod, General Synod, and the

⁶⁷. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.2. On AFSA and "Red scare", see also below, pp.

pages of *Anglican Outlook* were important instruments for this work, but they were not the only ones used. AFSA members were able to affect the Diocese through teaching at Rexford Layman's College. The College offered courses in theology, biblical studies, and pastoral psychology to layreaders and other interested lay people. During the winter of 1945-46, Sam Pollard lectured on the prophets of Israel,⁶⁸ John Kirby lectured on Christian Worship,⁶⁹ and Ernie Reed taught a course on "Implications of the faith".

The ten lectures of Reed's course had the following titles:

God's Fatherhood and the Individual
 God's Fatherhood and Society
 God's Creatorship and the Individual
 God's Creatorship and Society
 The Incarnation and the Individual
 The Incarnation and Society
 Christ's Sacrifice and the Individual
 Christ's Sacrifice and Society
 The Holy Spirit and the Individual
 The Holy Spirit and Society.⁷⁰

This outline and Kirby's lectures demonstrate an attempt to relate the faith of the church to the life of society and so point to a means by which AFSA's point of view was propagated within the Diocese. While it is possible that AFSA members taught courses at Rexford after 1946, we cannot be sure of this as the College advertised in the *Montreal Churchman* and that paper ceased publication in December 1946. *Anglican Outlook* published Rexford lectures after 1946, but none of those published were by AFSA members dealing with the issue of the church in society.

AFSA's principles were also advocated as clerical members raised social issues and acted upon them in their parishes. An outstanding example in this

⁶⁸. *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1945) p.11.

⁶⁹. *Ibid.*, Sept. 1945, p.17. These lectures were also published in *AO* (1,9 - 2,1).

⁷⁰. *Montreal Churchman* (Feb. 1946) p.22.

respect can be found in the Deanery of Bedford in the Eastern Townships where Ken Brueton and John Peacock helped to initiate a series of conferences on the church and rural life in which issues relating to stewardship of the land were discussed. The first of these meetings was held in 1943 and it was followed by several more in the next two years. While AFSA, as a group, was more concerned with industrial and economic issues, its belief that the earth's resources should be held as a common trust quite naturally led to concern for the use and ownership of the land. AFSA did advocate socialization of the land and individual members of the group supported Peacock and Brueton in their rural work. Percy Powles spoke on the topic, "Has the Church a Social Gospel for the Farmer?" at the first Conference on Rural Life in 1943 and Flynn Flanagan was the speaker at a conference in 1945.⁷¹ Other examples of parish action by AFSA members were the Regent Credit Union started by John Wagland with the support of H.H. "Nick" Walsh in 1943,⁷² and the parish mission organized by Roland Bodger at St. Cuthbert's in 1946. The theme of this mission was "God in Action in the World Today" and the topic of the addresses were: "The Drama of Redemption, Social Judgement, Social Grace, Social Sin, Social Redemption, Social Resurrection, and Social Action: the Reigning Christ."⁷³

While these activities through the Rexford Layman's College and at the parish level were important, they were not the primary means by which AFSA attempted to act on its rule, "to produce and distribute literature in support of our principles and to advocate them publicly." As we have already noted, it

⁷¹. *Ibid.*, (Nov. 1943) p.3; (June, 1944) p.16; (July, 1944) p.4; (Nov. 1944) p.20; (July, 1945) p.22; (Dec. 1945) p.22. See also *Canada and Christendom*, #15 (Sept. 1944) p.2.

⁷². AO 5,4 (Feb. 1950) p.17

⁷³. AO 1,10 (March 15, 1946) p.15.

was in Diocesan Synod and through General Synod and *Anglican Outlook* that the group sought to make an impact on the life of the Church on the local and national level. Within the Diocese, AFSA attempted to have its members appointed or elected to Synod committees dealing with social issues in order that a progressive report might be submitted, debated, and implemented through Synod. In the years following the group's formal organization, the Diocesan Council for Social Service, the Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order, and the Basic Stipend Committee were of special interest to AFSA. The group had some success in getting its members on these various committees, but they were never in possession of an absolute majority in any of them. They also had some success in raising important and controversial issues. Unfortunately, we cannot tell exactly what happened in debate at Synod, as only the reports, motions, and decisions are recorded in the Synod Journals. AFSA did manage to introduce and pass a resolution calling on the provincial government to repeal the Padlock Law.⁷⁴ But the group never succeeded in having adopted the measures of reform which it considered most important. Only in the case of the basic stipend was "success" a real possibility. In 1948, a motion to adopt the basic stipend was passed by the clergy but blocked by the laity. The same decision was reached in 1955 when all but one opponent of the scheme were laity.⁷⁵ A similar situation obtained in AFSA's attempts to influence the whole Canadian Church through General Synod and its committees. Again, AFSA was able to have some of its members elected as delegates to General Synods between 1946 and 1959, and some of these were appointed to important committees, but their efforts would appear to have been negligible in terms of the substantive resolutions passed. In

⁷⁴. AO 4,8 (June, 1947) p.2

⁷⁵. Cf. Morgan, *Anglican Church and Social Action*, p.50f.

conclusion it must be said that, while the group may have been successful in initiating discussion of critical issues, in the decision-making bodies of the official Church, the record of motions passed and actions taken proves AFSA to have been ineffective in nurturing actual change in the short term. This does not negate the positive influence the group may have had on individual priests and laymen, nor does it depreciate the value or importance of AFSA for us. Rather, I would say that the significance of AFSA's work in Synods lies not in its direct influence on the daily life of the institutional Church, but in its function as a medium for the expression of an alternate vision of the church and the world.

This function was also performed by *Anglican Outlook*. *The Anglican Outlook and News Digest* was founded by the Rev. Gregory Lee and Charles Inder, both of Ottawa. They began the paper in response to weaknesses in the *Canadian Churchman* and "a need in our Canadian Church for a national news magazine which is modern and attractive in format, which is efficient and up-to-date in news coverage, which is broad and comprehensive in outlook, and which is interesting and instructive in its articles and features."⁷⁶ The issue of one national Church paper had been discussed on the editorial pages of the *Churchman* during the war,⁷⁷ and an advisory editorial committee had been established by the Executive Council of General Synod in the Fall of 1942 to support the privately-owned paper in presenting the "news and views" of the whole Canadian Church.⁷⁸ Even the editor of the *Churchman* was critical of the state of the Church press, saying

⁷⁶. AO 1,1 (Nov. 1, 1945) p.7.

⁷⁷. See, e.g., CC (Feb. 19, 1942) p.120; (March 5, 1942) p.151; (March 12, 1942) p.168; (March 19, 1942) p.184; (April 2, 1942) p.215; (April 23, 1942) pp.264f.

⁷⁸. *Ibid.*, (Oct. 22, 1942) p.594.

there were too many papers (as each diocese attempted to publish its own monthly), most of which operated at a loss, requiring subsidies.⁷⁹ It is likely that Lee was familiar with these issues, as he had been a regular contributor to the *Churchman* during the war.⁸⁰ When *Anglican Outlook* published its first number in November, 1945, the editor of the *Churchman* welcomed the appearance of a second national paper. At the same time, he informed his readers that the *Churchman* had been considering a change in format "for some time" and that this would be forthcoming.⁸¹

In June, 1946, just eight months after it had begun publication, *Anglican Outlook* raised the issue of a "Church paper of Church papers."⁸² It was clear that one national Church paper would be more efficient and economical, but *Anglican Outlook* feared that official sponsorship might lead to censorship, albeit "amiable and informal". The issue at stake was editorial policy, for *Anglican Outlook* did not want to support the move to one national paper if it meant endorsing "an editorial policy which consists only in a nervous effort to echo the opinions or to flatter the prejudices of readers -- particularly influential readers." This was seen to be "only an inexcusable waste of our limited pulp-wood resources." There would appear to have been a similar fear among the paper's readers. One correspondent, obviously tongue-in-cheek, wrote, "I hope you will not be amalgamated into an official journal -- a sort of ecclesiastical *Pravda*."⁸³ The issue of one national paper was raised at General

79. *Ibid.*, (Oct. 22, 1942) p.594.

80. Gregory Lee wrote "Radio Column" for CC until May, 1942, and "Side-glances" from May, 1942 until July, 1945.

81. CC (Nov. 15, 1945) p.2.

82. *Ibid.*, 1,16 (June 15, 1946) p.11.

83. *Ibid.*, 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.19.

Synod in September, 1946, on the assumption that "the limited size of our constituency precludes the adequate support of two papers."⁸⁴ The motion eventually passed by the Synod recognized the 75 years of service given to the Canadian Church by the *Canadian Churchman* and called upon the Executive Committee to negotiate with the editors of both papers in the process of establishing "a Church paper as can serve as the organ of the whole Church."⁸⁵ It also deemed it "inadvisable" for General Synod to assume responsibility for the publication and editorship of such a paper. This concern would appear to have been forgotten by the Fall of 1947, when the Executive Committee of General Synod decided to support the *Canadian Churchman*.⁸⁶ Early in the next year it was decided that the *Churchman* should come under the direction of the General Board of Religious Education, a department of General Synod.⁸⁷

It is not surprising that *Anglican Outlook* failed to woo the Executive Committee, for the paper had become very critical of General Synod. This had not been its initial purpose. In its first number, *Anglican Outlook* announced that it had "no axe to grind" and that it would attempt "simply to be representative of and to serve the WHOLE of the Church of England in Canada."⁸⁸ The result was that, in its first dozen issues, *Anglican Outlook* published rather innocuous and platitudinous editorials on the family, the church, and social issues. This was sensed by at least one AFSA member who wrote to the paper in the spring of 1946. John Peacock had received *Canada and Christendom* and,

84. *GSJP* 1946, p.45.

85. *Ibid.*, pp.67 & 80.

86. *AO*, 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.14

87. *AO*, 3,5 (March 1948) p.14.

88. *AO* 1,1 (Nov. 1, 1945) p.1.

as Feilding had given his subscription list to Lee and Inder, he had been receiving *Anglican Outlook* from its start. Peacock said that when the new paper had appeared, he had hoped that it would be "at least progressive if not radical", but it had become clear to him that *Anglican Outlook* was "most anxious to be and stay conservative in its statements." He wished to cancel his subscription. Lee responded, saying that the paper represented neither "the Conservative Party at prayer" nor "the Communist Party at Mass."⁸⁹

Within a couple of months, however, there was an obvious change. The editorial of the May 1, 1946 issue dealt with religion and politics. The editor dismissed the hope that the two could somehow be separated and he made his point with a series of rhetorical questions:

Finally, it must be asked: how can a Church deeply involved in the social order, escape responsibility for that social order, and how can it discharge its responsibility without taking action which its enemies will immediately denounce as "political"? How can a Church which owns lands, invests its funds, invokes the law for its protection, and preaches about Christian vocation, claim to live in a world of its own serenely aloof from the sordid problems of property, finance, legal systems and industrial relations? It is significant that in the modern world, with its dangerous drift toward totalitarianism, that the voices grow even louder which urge Christians to keep out of politics -- which is, in effect to ask them to shut their eyes, deaden their minds, and drug their consciences. Even if the Church could be persuaded to ignore politics, there is no guarantee -- indeed, there is no likelihood -- that politics would ignore the Church. There is no haven to which the pious can fly in order to escape the hounds of modern secularism.⁹⁰

The shift in editorial policy was formalized in October, 1946. The editor noted that *Anglican Outlook* had begun to arouse concern because it had published

⁸⁹. AO, 1,9 (March, 1946) pp.6 & 15.

⁹⁰. *Ibid.*, 1,13 (May 1, 1946) p.9.

unpopular points of view. The editorial announced that the paper would not be muzzled, and said,

Beginning with Volume II (Nov. 1st issue), the *Outlook* will deal editorially and in specially chosen articles with some of the live issues before the Church and the World today. We shall exercise our prerogative to deal with these issues fearlessly and without consideration for what is considered "safe" or "official".⁹¹

The editorial which established *Anglican Outlook* as a paper "against the stream" appeared just a few months later, in February, 1947. An outspoken and sweeping criticism of the official Church was published under the title "Timocracy -- or Fence-Sitting." In it, the Church press, the Council for Social Service, and General Synod came under attack for their failure to speak courageously on social issues from a Christian point of view. The editor wrote,

Timocracy, fear for its respectability as an institution, fence-sitting on important and immediate issues, are robbing the church of its rightful heritage of leadership in opinion and action. Prayer demands performance; faith demands works. Let the church and its leaders stand vigourously and unafraid for righteousness for the common people everywhere, and let the church and its press slough off their timidity to present the right courageously and apply⁹² their platitudes to specific current situations.

The Montreal AFSA had been actively supporting the change in editorial policy announced in October, 1946. Lee had met several AFSA members at General Synod in September of that year, and since then, the editorial board of *Anglican Outlook* had been meeting in Montreal under Lee's chairmanship.⁹³ Evidence of AFSA's influence on the paper can be seen in the editorials published. Between

91. *Ibid.*, 1,20 (Oct. 1, 1946) p.20.

92. *Ibid.*, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.9.

93. Cf. *Ibid.*, 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.7.

October, 1946 and March, 1949, the paper published "Timocracy -- or Fence-sitting", called upon the Church to move beyond generalizations and statements of principle to specific condemnations of social evils, and condemned the Church of England in Canada for its failure to live out Christian principles in its own life.⁹⁴ The paper also began to speak to American foreign policy, international militarism, and the popular fear and suspicion in North America of anything related to Russia or socialism.⁹⁵ These two areas of concern were held together in the conviction that "the only way open to us to preserve international peace is to be whole-heartedly committed to the cause of social justice in our own country."⁹⁶ The paper also reflected AFSA's theological concerns. *Anglican Outlook* was critical of the Church's pre-occupation with individual salvation and the doctrine of God, and it advocated attention to the Incarnation and Resurrection as the safeguards against the view that the material world is of no consequence. It also emphasized the "Christian doctrine of man" as the true foundation of action in the world. The paper consciously identified with "the great sacramentalists who practised social action" and so placed itself within the English tradition of incarnational socialism.

Anglican Outlook continued to be printed in Ottawa until February, 1949. When Gregory Lee retired from the venture, the editorial board, already in Montreal, came under the chairmanship of H.H. "Nick" Walsh, who was Professor of Church History at McGill and an AFSA member. Beginning with the March, 1949 issue, the paper was printed in Montreal. Editorials printed after this date

⁹⁴. AO, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.9; 2,9 (July, 1947) p.10; 2,8 (June, 1947) p.10.

⁹⁵. AO, 2,2 (Dec. 1946) p.11; 2,3 (Jan. 1947) p.11; 2,6 (April, 1947) p.10; 2,7 (May, 1947) p.10; 2,11 (Sept. 1947) p.10.

⁹⁶. AO 2,7 (May, 1947) p.10.

can be considered representative of AFSA's point of view, for while they were written by one person, they were reviewed by the editorial board to ensure that they reflected its views.⁹⁷ When this statement of editorial process was published in the *Anglican Outlook* of March, 1950, the board consisted of 23 men, at least 16 of whom were AFSA members.⁹⁸ Articles written by AFSA members were subject to a similar process of revision. Manuscripts were submitted to the editor who would raise points of concern in an AFSA meeting and changes were made if the group wanted certain ideas stated differently.⁹⁹

By the late 'fifties, the editorial board was having difficulty managing the paper. *Anglican Outlook* was never able to depend solely on its income from subscriptions and advertising. Although Flynn Flanagan had managed to solicit financial assistance from some of his wealthier boyhood friends, such as John Molson, this was not enough to sustain the paper over the long term.¹⁰⁰ Finally, the decision to move the paper to a wider base was taken, and in the Fall of 1960, *Anglican Outlook* became the *Christian Outlook* under the editorship of an ecumenical board.¹⁰¹

97. AO, 5,5 (March, 1950) p.7.

98. Those listed as members of the editorial board of AO in 5,5 (March, 1950) p.2 were: (Montreal AFSA) Roland Bodger, R.H. Corbett, J.C. Flanagan, D.B. Harrison, J.C. Kirby, S.L. Pollard, E.S. Reed (then living in Gaspé), M.A. Stephens, H.H. Walsh; (Montreal SCC) J.F. Wagland; (Other AFSA members) R.C. Elliott (N.S.) D.C. Candy (Toronto), J.E. DeWolf (N.S.), W.M. Weber (New Jersey), G.S. Tanton (N.S.), K.H. Tufts (N.S.), and; (others) K.C. Bolton, W.A. Ferguson, W.H. Davison J.F. Fletcher, W. McKenna, W.E. Powles, R.V. Metcalfe. (Ferguson, Davison, and Fletcher, although sympathetic, were never members of AFSA; some of the others may have been members.)

99. Interview with Vince Goring.

100. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

101. See AO 15,8 (June-July 1960) p.6.

Anglican Outlook was the most important aspect of AFSA's work because it was the means of greatest influence. Through it the group was able to share its perspective with many more people than would ever have been possible in Synods and at Arundel. *Anglican Outlook* also allowed AFSA to support others across the country who shared the group's alienation from the ecclesiastical and social *status quo*. The underside of this greater influence, however, was that the paper also became the arena in which AFSA engaged an opposition which grew in proportion to the paper's profile.

Allies

The responses of the official Church to the Christian Sociology presented by Malvern point to a fairly progressive atmosphere in the Canadian Church during the last half of the war. This apparent openness to creative social thinking within the Church also provided the opportunity for more critical individuals and groups, such as Charles Feilding and the correspondents of *Canada and Christendom*, to express their judgement upon the Church and its failure to disassociate itself from the *status quo*. As a product of this dynamic, AFSA was able to draw on support from others within the Church still under the influence of Temple and Malvern and from other progressive groups outside the Church.

Within the Diocese of Montreal, AFSA received support from a few other clergy. The most notable example is Canon W.H. Davison, who had been the Rector of the Anglo-Catholic parish of St. John the Evangelist since 1917. In an interview, Flynn Flanagan said,

The most outstanding man for his time, to me, was Canon Davison. He stood up against the whole establishment on our behalf and it took a hell of a lot of courage at Synod. He cut his own throat.

He could have been a bishop for sure instead of Dixon, if he hadn't been an outspoken, real Christian.¹⁰²

Davison had supported the consideration of social questions in his parish during the war,¹⁰³ and he had served on the Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order (formerly the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems). Beginning in the fall of 1943, he had served as the chairman of the Montreal Council on the Christian Social Order, an ecumenical group which, by 1945, had representatives from the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Russian Orthodox Churches and five Protestant denominations. The Council's work seems to have been limited to the passing of resolutions and the issuing of public statements.¹⁰⁴ Another supportive priest in the Diocese was Kenneth Naylor, who also served on the Montreal Council. Naylor supported AFSA in the Diocesan Synod of 1945.¹⁰⁵ At the General Synod in 1949, he supported AFSA's criticisms of the suggestion that General Synod meet less frequently and with fewer delegates.¹⁰⁶ In general, however, the support of Davison and Naylor was neither constant nor unequivocal. Both were critical of articles in *Anglican Outlook*¹⁰⁷ and Davison was opposed to the basic stipend.¹⁰⁸

AFSA received the indirect support of Cannon Judd and the Council for Social Service as the *Bulletin* continued to legitimize Christian concern for the life

102. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

103. See, *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1943) p.17.

104. On the Montreal Council on the Christian Social Order, see, Cooper, *Blessed Communion*, p.199; *Montreal Churchman*, (Jan. 1946) p.19; (Feb. 1946) p.9; (June, 1945) p.23.

105. *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1945) p.20.

106. *AO*, 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.12.

107. See Davison's letter in *AO* 2,11 (Sept. 1947) p.14 and Naylor's letter in *AO*, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.17.

108. *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1943) p.20.

of society. Generally speaking, however, AFSA was too radical in its critique of capitalism and its condemnations of the Church's economic life to win the support of the CSS. The converse would also hold, that the Council was too cautious and conservative to endorse AFSA's position. Judd was especially reserved on the issue of Christian advocacy of specific social alternatives, as he held that it was not the role of the church to support "blueprints" for society.¹⁰⁹

While it has not been possible to investigate fully AFSA's relationships to other groups, it is clear that AFSA received moral support from at least two other groups in Montreal: the FCSO and the McGill SCM (Student Christian Movement). Flynn Flanagan had been involved in the League for Social Reconstruction, the CCF, and the FCSO since the thirties, and was a friend of the socialist professors at McGill: Frank Scott, Eugene Forsey, and R.B.Y. Scott.¹¹⁰ Another member of the FCSO who was very supportive was Alex Cameron, a United Church minister from the Eastern Townships. Cameron and other former members of the FCSO participated with AFSA in supporting the textile workers' strike in Valleyfield in 1946.¹¹¹ There was also a relationship between the Montreal FCSO and the McGill SCM, as some of the students occasionally did leg-work, such as ushering at meetings, for the FCSO.¹¹² Several AFSA members had belonged to the SCM, notably Cyril and Marjorie Powles, Vince Goring, W.J. Bishop, and, in Toronto, Doug Candy. Bishop and Goring both left parish work to serve as SCM

109. AO 1,7 (Feb. 1946) p.12. See also, AO 2,8 (June, 1947) p.18.

110. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

111. Interview with Cyril Powles. Cameron signed a letter protesting Duplessis' treatment of labour with six AFSA members. See "Duplessis Action Is Protested," *Montreal Standard* (Jan. 18, 1947).

112. Interview with Cyril Powles.

secretaries. Another priest and former member of the McGill SCM, Don (or Dan) Heap, was supportive of AFSA, although he never became a member.

One group with which AFSA had a close relationship was the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, although it must also be said that this relationship was not always supportive. Contact with the SCC was first made through Joseph Fletcher, who recommended Frederick Hastings Smyth as the speaker for the second Arundel Conference. Hastings Smyth's early correspondence regarding AFSA communicates hope for a close relationship with the Montreal group. Shortly before the 1944 Conference, he wrote to Sam Pollard,

... I hope that the Conference may contribute to a closer consolidation of our ranks so that we may find ways of taking organized part in the advancing world revolutionary enterprise. Plans for organization -- this should be the practical fruits of such a conference as you propose.¹¹³

His initial impression of AFSA was very positive. He described the Conference as a "success" and said,

They have got together a perfectly swell bunch of Montreal Priests (sic) as a little nucleus for proper Catholic Action. I only wish that we had anything like them around here.¹¹⁴

While he described the majority of the AFSA members as "Low Church" liturgically, Smyth said they retained "a kind of Sacramental sense" which he had experienced in England and found lacking "even in the so-called 'high' quarters of the (Protestant Episcopal) Church" in the U.S.A.¹¹⁵ In the same letter he expressed the hope that two or three members of the group might visit the Oratory of

113. Frederick Hastings Smyth to the Reverend S.L. Pollard, n.d. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth. Reference to the upcoming conference and Smyth's preaching engagement on Sunday, August 24, 1944, indicate the letter was written sometime in the summer of that year.

114. F. Hastings Smyth to Peter Ruderman, September 11, 1944. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

115. Ibid.

the SCC in Cambridge and said, "It is even suggested that there may be a nucleus here for the formation of a unit of the S.C.C. We shall see."

AFSA did not move to form an SCC cell. In a letter to John Peacock of July, 1945, Smyth said he was "somewhat disappointed" that this had not happened, but he understood that the SCC's radicalism might be a hinderance to AFSA in some of its practical work.¹¹⁶ He recognized that AFSA had a wider appeal than the SCC. Nonetheless, as a Marxist he was very critical of the CCF influence in AFSA and realized, as early as January, 1946, that AFSA would be incompatible with the SCC if the Social Democrats became the dominant force in the group. His point of view was clearly expressed in a letter to Sam Pollard when he said,

I don't like this infiltration of S.D.'s (Social Democrats). I don't trust the theoretical basis of the C.C.F. and I wish that AFSA had nothing to do with it. It's too bad that Flynn F. is so mixed up with it, and, as I understand, with AFSA's blessing. We must never get entangled with anti-communists, and I've never heard worse red-baiting than from C.C.F. members in Canada. ...one cannot escape the objective truth that the Marxian basis of social change is scientifically sound, and that reformists are the stooges (sometimes wittingly, more often, unwittingly) of the worst kind of social reaction.¹¹⁷

Despite these reservations, Smyth moved to bring AFSA closer to the SCC. As some AFSA members later joined the SCC, it is likely that Smyth was acting with the support of the more radical members within the Montreal group. He attended the Arundel Conference in August, 1946, and a liason meeting between the two groups was planned for October of that year. Another point on which AFSA and the SCC differed was worship, and Smyth and Peacock both hoped that

¹¹⁶. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, July 10, 1945. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

¹¹⁷. F. Hastings Smyth to Sam Pollard, January 24, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

AFSA's liturgical sense and especially its understanding of the offertory of the Mass would be sharpened through this meeting.¹¹⁸

Three AFSA members (one each from Montreal, Nova Scotia, and Newark, New Jersey) visited the Oratory on October 15, 1946. While Smyth wrote positively of the meeting in a letter to Ray Corbett,¹¹⁹ his other letters reveal his deeply-felt reservations concerning AFSA. To one SCC member he wrote,

... the present organization, so far as I can discover, is on nothing like the level of our own S.C.C. In fact they seem to have members who are very anti-Communist and who know nothing of Marxism, and others who are terribly afraid of being "High Church." Now such an organization can be of great use if it gets going. So far, all that I have seen of it gives me the impression of great enthusiasm and earnestness of purpose. It can include I think a great many more people than would come all the way into the S.C.C. But what I am trying to discover at this point is just how we may conceivably work in close contact with them, while at the same time we in no way equivocate our position. This I don't yet know exactly. I only do know that when the bunch first organized in Montreal, they did not think it possible to organize themselves as an actual unit of this Society. Our conditions are too extreme, so they thought, to enable a sufficiently wide membership. ... I am not yet convinced that Membership in the S.C.C. is entirely compatible with membership in AFSA.¹²⁰

At the same time, an article in the *Bulletin* of the SCC said that, while AFSA was not as advanced as the SCC in matters of dogma, liturgy, and politics, it was hoped that the two groups might move closer together in the future. At this

118. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, September 30, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

119. F. Hastings Smyth to Ray Corbett, October 19, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

120. F. Hastings Smyth to the Rev. Frank V.H. Carthy, October 16, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

point, the idea of AFSA as a "front" for the SCC was proposed in the following terms:

For while the S.C.C. can help the AFSA in the clarification of its concepts both in Liturgy and in scientific secular analysis, AFSA, being as it is more broadly based within the parish membership of the Church, can be of great value in mediating our theories and analyses to a wider Church public than the S.C.C. is apt to reach with its more demanding theoretical basis.¹²¹

This vision probably had the support of those AFSA members who were attracted to Smyth's theology of the church in history. However, as the adoption of the SCC's theoretical framework implied the displacement of the CCF or Social Democratic influence in AFSA, attempts to forge this unity of opinion naturally met with opposition. Smyth's letters to Ray Corbett and John Peacock in the Spring of 1947 refer to "difficulties" in AFSA. Smyth attributed these to "a difference of understanding and of analysis of the nature of the social process in history" and said,

For myself I am convinced of the general validity of the dialectic analysis of all history. And I think that any Incarnational group, if it is to sustain its inner unity and is to act effectively within its environment, must come to agreement in this basic matter of scientific belief. I can imagine instructed dialecticians working along with those who are more or less ignorant of the theory: but I cannot imagine them working for very long with those who *deny* it. Because affirmation and denial of the dialectic is precisely the division between reformists and revolutionaries.¹²²

Smyth had an opportunity to address this problem of "orthodoxy" when he

121. "Anglican Fellowship for Social Action at the Oratory," *Bulletin of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth* 11,5 (Twentieth Sunday After Pentecost, 1946, Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ the King) p.2. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

122. F. Hastings Smyth to Ray Corbett, April 2, 1947. Cf. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, April 2, 1947. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

spoke on the theme "Dialectics for Christians" at the 1947 Arundel Conference. However, it would appear that he failed to win over the majority in AFSA, for he returned from the conference "more convinced than ever" that leadership from the SCC was necessary to keep AFSA from falling entirely under the influence of the Social Democrats. He began to propose the establishment of an SCC cell in New Jersey whose members would work within the AFSA group there.¹²³ Smyth's correspondence does not make clear the success or failure of this strategy in New Jersey.

Smyth did have some success in gaining SCC members from the Montreal AFSA group, but his strategy of infiltration failed. When John Wagland and John Rowe joined the SCC in July, 1948, they were "kicked out of AFSA." According to Smyth, "the AFSA bunch decided that they could not tolerate what they called a 'divided loyalty'."¹²⁴ Unfortunately, there is no documentation available presenting AFSA's understanding of the conflict. Two of the AFSA members I interviewed said that the SCC members left voluntarily.¹²⁵

Despite the controversy between the SCC and AFSA, Hastings Smyth played an important role in shaping AFSA's thought. In general, he was an exponent of sacramental socialism and so contributed to AFSA's understanding of the centrality of the Incarnation and the church's revolutionary role in history. Specifically, he impressed on AFSA the importance of the liturgy as a focus

123. F. Hastings Smyth to the Rev. Frank V.H. Carthy, August 30, 1947. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

124. F. Hastings Smyth to Marshall Swan, July 22, 1948. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

125. Interviews with Vince Goring and Flynn Flanagan.

for social change and convinced the group of the need to recapture, in the offertory of the Mass, a sense of the transfiguration or "trans-ordering" of the whole of human existence. The great attraction of the SCC for some AFSA members was the theology of Hastings Smyth, for it filled a gap in AFSA's position. AFSA never produced a systematic theology, but relied on an informal synthesis of ideas and images borrowed from other progressive groups and thinkers. The lack of a comprehensive and consistent theological position was considered by Smyth to be one of AFSA's great weaknesses. The SCC, on the other hand, offered a clear and systematic apologetic for radical social action built upon a Catholic framework. While AFSA used elements of Smyth's thought to support its action, the group was not willing to adopt his system as a whole. I believe this was Smyth's real frustration with AFSA. In the end, there were only four AFSA members who joined the SCC: Marjorie and Cyril Powles, John Wagland, and John Rowe.

I have already mentioned the AFSA groups outside Montreal, in Toronto, Nova Scotia, and New Jersey. Unfortunately, the details of the inter-relationships of these groups are obscure, and more research is needed to bring them to light. At this point, it would simply be appropriate to note that the Montreal group had *some* support outside the Diocese, although it is not clear when or how this solidarity was expressed.

Opposition

Some support would have been helpful as the Montreal AFSA encountered opposition in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and from laymen in the business community. Shortly after John Dixon was elected Bishop of Montreal, a group of businessmen, concerned about the views being expressed by the more radical members of Synod, invited Dixon to lunch at the St. James Club. They explained that, if this "red" group persisted in its activities, the Church would begin

losing money.¹²⁶ This kind of intimidation would appear to have had a rather direct effect. In the early years of his episcopate Dixon moved away from his identification with Temple to a much more cautious, restrained, and pious attitude to social issues. This movement is obvious from a comparison of his address on "The Church's Right to Speak" at the "Christianity or Chaos" conference of January, 1943, with the trite and almost smarmy letters he published each month in the *Montreal Churchman*. At the conference Dixon was critical of the individualism latent in the Reformation which undermined the tradition of Christian social responsibility and he denounced the "fatal compromise of Christian idealism for private life and pagan realism for public life, false principles left to work their evil results while individuals and groups try to ease the sores by Christian Charity."¹²⁷ His letters in the *Montreal Churchman* following his enthronement reflected none of these attitudes. Most of them centred on little expositions of Scripture, anecdotes, or the administrative and organizational needs of the institution -- funds, manpower, and returning war veterans. The first time he touched on social issues was in the June, 1944 edition, where he wrote about the "New Order" and the Kingdom of God. In this article, Dixon minimized the relationship between the will of God and social justice by stressing the "spiritual" character of the Kingdom and the soothing, inner peace which it implies. He wrote,

When the Messiah comes, the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the poor -- have employment and better houses and

126. Interview with Flynn Flanagan. Flynn knew of this meeting as one of those present later told him about it.

127. *Montreal Churchman*, (March, 1943) pp.8-9.

more food? No. The poor have the gospel preached to them.¹²⁸

Because of his movement from support of moderate reform to resistance to change, from criticism to passivity, Dixon emerges as an analogue of the general shift in popular attitudes from openness to retrenchment. The issue on which Dixon's opposition to AFSA was most obvious was the basic stipend. He is reported to have said that, even if the plan were passed by Synod he would veto it.¹²⁹ The reasons for his disapproval are not clear, but he would appear to have believed that the plan would lead to "lying and hypocrisy among the clergy."¹³⁰ It is also possible that Dixon did not give jobs to some progressive priests.¹³¹

The Bishop was not AFSA's most successful opponent. The accommodation to the *status quo* prevalent in post-war North America found its strongest expression in the Diocese in the loosely-organized group of businessmen and lawyers which emerged to resist AFSA. Some of these were Judd McKinnon, Jackson Dodds, R.P. Jellet, H.L. Cross, and B.M. Hallward.¹³² The most visible member of the group and the one who became their unofficial spokesman was P.C. Armstrong, "a consultant economics adviser (sic) and public relations executive in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway."¹³³ It is probable that his first contact with AFSA was made in 1947 when he became a member of the Diocesan Council for

128. *Ibid.*, (June, 1944) p.5.

129. Interview with Flynn Flanagan and Vince Goring.

130. *AO*, 5,8 (June, 1950) p.2.

131. Interview with Sam Pollard.

132. Interview with Flynn Flanagan

133. *AO*, 4,3 (Jan. 1949) p.9.

Social Service, serving with Sam Pollard, Flynn Flanagan, M.A. Stephens, Nick Walsh, and Ray Corbett. It was a year later, in May 1948, that P.C. Armstrong began his lively correspondence with the *Anglican Outlook*. His letters and the *Outlook's* replies dealt with the basic stipend, pensions, Diocesan politics, economic ideology, and international peace.

P.C. Armstrong entered the debate over basic stipend with an article in *Anglican Outlook* titled "A Layman Looks at Basic Stipend."¹³⁴ He correctly noted that the arguments in favour of basic stipend were based on moral considerations and aimed at a brotherly sharing of material rewards among the clergy. His major objection was to the assumption that the Church could move from the present practice of congregationally-based stipends to a centrally-organized system. Armstrong held that, because stipends are paid by the congregation from voluntary donations by the laity, they cannot be considered guaranteed payments which could simply be transferred to a central, diocesan fund. He said it was unrealistic to assume that a congregation which paid a stipend of \$4,000 to its rector would raise the same sum in order to donate it to a central fund. Furthermore, he noted that stipends are only a part of a clergyman's financial reward and he feared that the basic stipend system would forbid the donation of personal gifts or the provision of special amenities to the rector by individual lay people, or that it would lead to a system of basic rectories. In his argument, Armstrong focused on the congregation as the basic expression of the church and he emphasized the relationship of the congregation to the parish priest. He held that the basic stipend would entail "a revolutionary change in the constitution of the church." As an alternative, he proposed that the problem of poor stipends could be dealt with

¹³⁴. AO, 5,9 (July, 1950) pp.10-11.

by "trying to increase the spirit of giving" and suggested that any clergy who wished to enter into a voluntary pooling of their salaries might do so immediately.

The next issue of *Anglican Outlook* contained letters from a couple of correspondents who disagreed with P.C. Armstrong.¹³⁵ "Parish Priest" stressed the "morally intolerable" dilemma faced by married clergy who must choose between their vocation and the economic needs of their families, and he attempted to meet some of Armstrong's specific objections. He argued that the laity make donations to the church, and denounced P.C. Armstrong's congregational bias as a "low opinion of our people." His letter said, "It is not one particular man they are supporting unless the deity they worship is the local parish god." He noted the system of paying missionary clergy from a central fund, saying this proved the willingness of the laity to support the Church beyond the parish. He also noted that this mission system was also denounced as unrealistic and utopian when it was first proposed. With respect to forbidding personal gifts to the clergy, "Parish Priest" suggested that the clergy need to be exposed to "the stresses and strains of life" and not "wrapped in cotton wool and protected.": "To forbid 'extras' may make for a better, because more understanding, priesthood."

In the same issue, a letter from Roland Bodger accused P.C. Armstrong of assuming that the laity were not as Christian as the clergy. Bodger's letter was very short and his point not well-argued, but it would appear that he was basing his accusation on Armstrong's suggestion that the clergy should enter into a voluntary sharing of their stipends because their congregations are much too selfish and tight-fisted to support anyone but "their man". This was the

¹³⁵. AO 5,10 (Aug. 1950) p.14

crux of the argument which P.C. Armstrong refined and reiterated in a long letter to the *Outlook*, published in October 1950.¹³⁶ He said that, of the two available means of implementing the basic stipend, only voluntary adoption by the clergy was possible because adoption by the laity through Church legislation would lead to a disruption of the relationship between incumbents and their congregations.

Leaving aside for the moment the ideological dispute underlying this controversy, I believe the differences of opinion between AFSA and P.C. Armstrong on basic stipend can be related to a fundamentally different experience of "church". For Armstrong, the church was the local congregation whereas for AFSA, the church was understood in more global, catholic and trans-historical terms. This difference in perspective is also evident in the positions held by AFSA and P.C. Armstrong on the question of pensions.

Early in 1950, the Parish of St. Matthias, the wealthy Westmount congregation of which both P.C. Armstrong and Flynn Flanagan were members, established a retirement fund for its incumbent. At the parochial meeting at which this action was moved and voted upon, only Flynn Flanagan dissented and he later expressed his disapproval in *Anglican Outlook*. AFSA's basic concern with stipends was the inequality of remuneration which encouraged clergy to "sell-out" the Gospel for the sake of wealthier parishes and the economic security they offered. AFSA was pleased, therefore, that pensions were based on years of service and not on contributions made to the pension fund, for thus a priest's income in retirement would reflect his labour, not his "success" in climbing the ladder of ecclesiastical hierarchy. However, because AFSA was fundamentally opposed to unequal pay for equal work, the St. Matthias retirement fund was seen to be

¹³⁶. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.13.

the worst that could be produced by an unjust system. In his response to *Anglican Outlook's* criticism of the fund, P.C. Armstrong said there was no reason why a parish which paid its own bills and contributed to diocesan funds should not provide for the needs of its rector.¹³⁷ He told the paper not to interfere in what was essentially an internal matter for the parish alone to decide. Unfortunately for Armstrong, Diocesan Synod decided that the issue was important to the whole Church and passed a resolution which disapproved of "the setting up of Parochial Pension Funds for the Clergy."¹³⁸ In the June 1950 issue of *Anglican Outlook*, a letter from J.C. Kirby attacked Armstrong's misunderstanding of Anglican polity and his implicit understanding of the Church.¹³⁹ Kirby argued that the Diocese, with its bishop, (and not the congregation and its pastor) is the basic unit of the Church and that Armstrong's "self-sustaining autonomous parish" is an anomaly in Anglican polity. He criticized Armstrong's tacit suggestion that "those who pay the most money to the general funds of the whole church have the greatest right to be heard," and he defended *Anglican Outlook's* right to criticize St. Matthias saying that in the Church, as in a family, "what effects (sic) one is the concern of all."

With these two issues, basic stipend and pensions, and in the underlying issue of congregational autonomy, P.C. Armstrong entered into conflict with AFSA's concern that the economic life of the Church reflect the fellowship proclaimed by the Gospel. A related "ecclesiastical" issue on which Armstrong corresponded with *Anglican Outlook*, was the politics of Synod. In a letter published in June, 1951, he responded to Sam Pollard's charge that there was

137. *AO*, 5,7 (May, 1950) p.13.

138. *AO*, 5,8 (June, 1950) p.2.

139. *Ibid.*, p.15.

circulated at Synod a blacklist of persons not to be voted for.¹⁴⁰ Armstrong insisted that no such list had been circulated, although he was aware that members often discussed whom they would elect to the various committees of Synod. In the same letter, however, Armstrong also complained about a "small but highly organized minority" which had been having its members elected to committees and delegations "by concentrating their votes on the names of a few individuals." This was, of course, a reference to AFSA, as the group had been employing such a strategy since the war. A further letter from Armstrong published in December, 1951, revealed that a similar strategy had, in fact, been used by AFSA's opponents.¹⁴¹ In this letter, he again complained that "a small but highly organized group" had been "plumping" in elections, and said:

Others in the Synod, impatient at this obvious thwarting of the normal process of election, have agreed among themselves to select a complete slate for various committees and delegations, and have had no difficulty in obtaining large majorities for that slate.

On this point, both AFSA and its adversaries from the business community employed a strategy based on control of Synod's committees. By keeping AFSA members out of such positions, Armstrong and "the boys" (as they were called by Flynn Flanagan) could ensure that progressive or radical motions would not be presented for debate and "red" opinions would not be aired.

The other issues on which AFSA and P.C. Armstrong entered into conflict related to AFSA's general resistance to the "McCarthyism" of the late 'forties

140. AO 6,8 (June, 1951) pp.14-15.

141. AO 4,4 (Dec. 1951) pp.12-13.

and early 'fifties. As we have already noted, progressive attitudes became quite unpopular following the war and criticisms of the *status quo* were met with charges of "communism" or treason. AFSA and *Anglican Outlook* became the targets of such red-baiting because of their views on the relationship of socialism and Christianity, their critique of Christendom, and their unwillingness to support American foreign policy.

In its response to the Red scare, AFSA tended to proceed *via negativa*; that is, the group tended not to emphasize their positive advocacy of a socialist alternative to the existing order, but, rather, criticized the assumption that capitalism and America are essentially "Christian". In so doing, AFSA attempted to identify and emphasize the contradictions in the dominant ideas of the day. This strategy employed many different arguments. For instance, in response to various correspondents who had accused *Anglican Outlook* of expressing communist views, the editor denied as a false dichotomy the division of the world into two antagonistic camps, claiming that both Communists and the Western democracies share a common bondage to determinism.¹⁴² Then, quoting Berdyayev, he presented Christianity as a third power capable of bringing faith and order to the chaos of the industrialized world. The essence of this apologetic is clear when the editor writes,

May we humbly suggest to our critics that when we take issue with what we believe to be a horrible caricature of Christianity (i.e., the Christian society of Western democracies) that we are not "going Communist", but that we are endeavouring to hold before our readers an Incarnational view of society that stands in sharp contrast to the deterministic creeds of Western Capitalism and Russian Communism.¹⁴³

142. AO 4,4 (Feb. 1949) p.8

143. *Ibid.*

A similar argument used in addressing the popular mood was based on the exhortation, "Judge not, that you be not judged " (Mt. 7:1). AFSA attempted to point to instances in which capitalism was guilty of the same offences used to discredit communism. In November, 1948, Sam Pollard wrote,

Before accusing others of lying propaganda we should be quite certain that our tongue is clean and our pen is accurate; before swallowing the newspaper headlines on the perfidity of other countries, we should be prepared to pass judgement on our own instead of taking it for granted that we alone, whether as individuals or nations, manifest charity, nobility, truth, goodness and a devotion to peace and democracy.¹⁴⁴

This kind of argument was used to condemn prejudice on the basis of political opinion in North America¹⁴⁵ and to relativize condemnations of practices in Communist countries.¹⁴⁶ A variation on this theme was presented by J.C. Kirby who wrote,

(One) wonders what difference there is between taking sides in a class war and in an international war; most ecclesiastics bless the latter and curse the former.¹⁴⁷

In so reasoning, AFSA was attempting to overthrow the rigid definition of the international situation which saw communism and the West in simple terms of black and white. This argument was extended and developed to become a challenge to some of the basic assumptions underlying the popular vision of Western democracy as the well-spring and guardian of freedom and

144. AO 4,1 (Nov. 1948) p.13

145. See, e.g., AO 7,5 (March, 1952) p.8

146. See, e.g., AO 4,7 (May, 1949) p7; 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7

147. AO 2,7 (May, 1947) p.18.

truth. The orthodoxy of democracy was portrayed as a denial of freedom of speech and attempts to muzzle those who presented unpopular progressive views was compared with the medieval Inquisition and Calvinist witch-burnings.¹⁴⁸ The public denunciation of those who had been associated with groups labelled "subversive" by the Attorney General in the United States was condemned as fascist allegiance to the idea of a totalitarian state.¹⁴⁹ The tacit support given such activities by the media, and especially the very obvious endorsement by *Life Magazine*, was considered evidence of an ideological bias which contradicted the freedom and objectivity of the press.¹⁵⁰ AFSA accused *Life* of pandering to American hysteria and using Christianity as an ideological crutch in order to boost circulation.¹⁵¹ The group also attempted to destroy the image of the United States as a highly-principled white knight engaged in a cosmic struggle against the forces of evil by denying the reality of any so-called ideological war between East and West. AFSA saw the conflict between the two camps to be a war of power politics aimed at control of resources and manpower.¹⁵²

AFSA employed a similar tactic of "myth-breaking" with respect to the Church's role in supporting the *status quo* and sustaining the mood of McCarthyism. By attempting to expose the ways in which the Church and its faith was being used to defend certain political and economic motives, AFSA was, in a sense, driving a wedge between the Church's accommodation to the

148. AO 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7

149. AO 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6.

150. AO 3,10 (Aug. 1948) p.13; 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6.

151. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

152. AO 5,10 (Aug. 1950) pp.6-7; 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

status quo and the popular understanding of the Church as a "spiritual" body that is somehow "above and beyond" "the changes and chances of this fleeting world."¹⁵³ AFSA believed that Western civilization was in decline because of its loss of faith in God and the Christian vision of human-ness. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

We are perfectly well aware that Western civilization is sick unto death because it has moved off its Christian foundations, and that the consequent enfeeblement of Christianity is the cause of the rise of totalitarian systems -- they are moving into a spiritual void.¹⁵⁴

AFSA also understood, however, that a totalitarian system in North America would take the guise of Christian faith in order to fill this void. Just as Constantine had used the Church to prop up a falling empire, Christianity would be used to legitimize a decadent capitalism.¹⁵⁵ The period offered some very obvious examples of this dynamic. One of these came from *Life Magazine*, whose editor, Henry Luce, attempted to create an ideological foundation for the American way of life from a synthesis of Christian and Jewish beliefs.¹⁵⁶ The most crass example appeared in 1951, when the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States published this incredible statement:

CREDO OF HOPE

We believe that American business can and must save the world.

We believe that political, social and economic chaos exists because, while we nominally are a Christian nation, we have forsaken Christian philosophy

153. "An Order for Compline," Book of Common Prayer (Canada, 1962) p.727.

154. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.7.

155. AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.8.

156. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

to such an extent that we are now predominantly a materialist nation.

We believe that in every chaos there is the seed of rebuilding and that in this present chaos one of the seeds of rebuilding is the fear in the heart of we materialists that we will lose our material gains.

We believe that political leaders have demonstrated that they are unable to mount an offensive in an ideological war.

We believe that in a materialist nation economic forces are the potent forces. We believe that the American business associations are the only groups that can and will put the money on the line to re-sell Christian philosophy to America, and thus smother out communism and other false ideologies. We believe that, except for the federal treasury, the economic power joined by the American business associations is the only force equal to the task of waging and winning a national and international ideological war.

We believe that the American business organizations are the only agencies that can co-ordinate and thus make effective all of the movements that are now selling partial or watered-down portions of the Sermon on the Mount.

We believe that business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Economic Development, The Advertising Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Bankers Association, can and must spearhead the effort to wage and win an ideological war.

We believe that the National Association of Manufacturers can and should call together the heads of the principal business organizations and organize an Ideological War Council.

We believe that the Council should call in three outstanding ideological leaders, one Catholic, one Protestant and one Jew and commission them to confer and come forth with a statement of simple truths commonly accepted in a Judeo-Christian civilization. These truths should be given to a staff of five top men in the advertising industry of America and those top men should be commissioned to prepare them for sale.

We believe that then these truths should be sold by all the modern means of advertising, through all modern means of communication, on a mass production scale.

We believe that such an ideological offensive can be launched immediately, that it can spread rapidly throughout the nation and can then be extended throughout the world.

We believe that Almighty God will bless the effort.¹⁵⁷

157. Reprinted in *AO* 6,9 (July, 1951) pp.6-7

In the case of statements such as this, AFSA had no difficulty supporting its claim that Christian faith was being used as a tool to support the economic and political interests of capitalism. Unfortunately, however, the Church of England in Canada's implication in the popular mood was harder to identify because it was more subtle. AFSA attempted to point out similarities between the editorial positions adopted by the *Canadian Churchman* and the attitudes expressed by *Life* and the National Association of Manufacturers.¹⁵⁸ The group also decried as passive capitulation the Church's failure to speak critically on the signs of the times. This argument against a silent church was put forward in an *Outlook* editorial which read,

It would appear that the Anglican Church in Canada through its local representative bodies, its synods, is deciding that eloquent silence shall give support to USA leadership in the field of international affairs ...¹⁵⁹

AFSA understood this silence to be a symptom of the Church's accommodation to the *status quo* and its timocracy or rule by fear. Another editorial said,

The official church is quite plainly conservative in its approach to controversial questions because it is subject to conservative pressure from its monetary constituency which is now operating under the fear motive and has become more reactionary.¹⁶⁰

The issue on which the Church was most easily convicted of collusion with American foreign policy was the Communist-Nationalist war in China. AFSA was critical of the caricatures presented by the secular press which portrayed the Nationalists as Christian and the Communists as un-Christian, despite ample evidence that both sides were guilty of brutal and violent acts against the Chinese people.¹⁶¹ Specifically, AFSA condemned the *Canadian Churchman*, for contributing to a popular view of Chiang Kai-Shek as a devout Christian,

¹⁵⁸. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) pp.7-8

¹⁵⁹. AO 6,8 (June, 1951) pp.8-10; cf. 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7.

¹⁶⁰. AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.8.

¹⁶¹. AO 2,11 (Sept. 1947) pp.5-6.

and the Missionary Society for the pro-Nationalist stand taken in its Bulletin of 1948.¹⁶² The general issue of war and peace was another issue on which it was easier for AFSA to criticize the Church. Given the fear of a war with Russia (which was, at least initially, the source of "Red scare") the advocacy of international peace and the voluntary limitation of arms by Western powers came to be denounced as "communist". AFSA was critical of the United States' aggressive policy of containment and the establishment of NATO because it considered these to be the preparations for a third world war.¹⁶³ In taking this position, the group again laid itself open to charges of communism and treason. AFSA's response was to emphasize peace as a Christian value and it condemned the Church's failure to take leadership in the movement for harmony in international relations as a further example of its bondage to the *status quo*.¹⁶⁴ This criticism was stated as follows:

The Christian Church -- and the church alone -- is the only thing that can give society what William James long ago pronounced "the moral equivalent for war". But the Church is too timid. Our synodical gatherings, conventions, conferences and assemblies are afraid to give this leadership because of the fear of misuse by the Kremlin, for fear of publication in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* that the Church of England in Canada stands for peace.¹⁶⁵

With respect to the Korean war, AFSA attempted to show that Christianity was again being used to further the interests of Western capitalism. An editorial

162. AO 4,5 (March, 1949) p.8.

163. See, e.g., AO 5,2 (Dec. 1949) pp.6-8

164. See e.g., AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) pp.6-7; 7,8 (June-July, 1952) p.6; 8,10 (Oct. 1953) pp.14-15.

165. AO 7,8 (June-July, 1952) p.6.

published in *Anglican Outlook* in March 1951 read,

Christians, awake! Wipe the murky mists of propaganda from your eyes. Discern whether or not it is Christ that bids us extend his kingdom with tanks and jet planes, with flame-throwers and, if necessary, atom bombs, to blacken and annihilate hundreds of tiny Korean villages and to "liberate" their folk with mutilation and death ...
Bethink you, Christians, are you taking sides in a war between Christ's pure gospel and the sadistic materialism of the communists? ... Aren't you trying to propagate, in the name of Christ, a western civilization devoid of his spirit of serenity, of ardent love and selfless sacrifice; a civilization of profit motive, of burning competition, of abject devotion to supply and demand and laissez-faire? Do you want peace because peace is of God, or are you scared speechless at the word *Peace* because peacemakers are no longer called the children of God but communist stooges?¹⁶⁶

It is to AFSA's credit that, upon hearing of anti-American sentiments being expressed in Europe late in 1953, it warned that an irrational and hysterical anti-Americanism "can be just as dangerous to the peace of the world as an irrational fear of Communism."¹⁶⁷

Finally, in defending its critique of Western capitalism, AFSA sought to legitimize its position by quoting or citing well-respected theologians, such as Maurice or Temple. The group also reminded its opponents of the more progressive or tolerant attitudes being expressed by various synods or councils. The most important of these were the condemnations of both capitalism and communism pronounced by General Synod in 1949, by the Lambeth Conference in 1948, and by the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶. AO 6,5 (March, 1951) pp.6-7.

¹⁶⁷. AO 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.6.

¹⁶⁸. See e.g., AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6; 6,8 (June 1951) pp.6-8; 8,8 (June-July 1953) pp.7-8.

In general, AFSA was neither intimidated nor disturbed by the red-baiting of its adversaries. The group understood its role as a prophetic leaven and expected the rich and powerful within the Church to attempt to discredit them by whatever means were available. The charges of communism and treason deserved little more than the sarcasm they received in the editorial which read,

Perhaps we should not take too seriously the sniping that has been going on in the *Canadian Churchman* at *The Anglican Outlook*. But we can hardly refrain from expressing amazement at the assortment of associations in which we are now involved. The super-complacent writer of the article on the Diocese of Montreal in one of the July issues of the *Canadian Churchman* has seen fit to link us up with Higher Criticism, Modernism, Radical Socialism and Pan-Protestant pressure -- all of which the great "Conservative Diocese of Montreal is able to survive because "Montreal is cooler than Ottawa." In a later issue of the *Churchman*, *The Anglican Outlook* turns up again in an article on the Office of the Primacy. The author of the article, the Venerable R.C. Blagrove accuses us of editorially blasting "the traditions and practices of the Church" in a "tissue of half-truths" which the good Archdeacon thinks "might have come straight from the Kremlin as a standard piece of propaganda to be used in all professedly Christian publications". It was with considerable alarm that we turned to our July editorials to see wherein we had committed this great crime. But the only blast we could discover which might in some remote way correspond to the Archdeacon's stricture was our disapproval of the National Association of Manufacturers' plan to sell Christian philosophy. It is difficult to take this sort of criticism seriously; ...¹⁶⁹

Given such silly attempts at defamation, AFSA continued, perhaps with some delight, to present its case using the arguments described above. The editorial policy of *Anglican Outlook* retained its critical edge.

169. AO 7,1 (Nov. 1951) p.7

Decline

The AFSA members I interviewed could not remember when the group had disbanded. This suggests that the Fellowship expired with a whimper, rather than a bang. *Anglican Outlook* continued to be published in Montreal until 1960, although it had become apparent by the middle of 1959 that the Montreal group was finding it very difficult to carry on.¹⁷⁰ It is likely that the AFSA group had ceased to be a decisive voice in diocesan affairs by the mid 'fifties. AFSA's influence was certainly absent from the 1958 report of the Diocesan Council for Social Service, of which Ray Corbett wrote,

In a day of perpetual cold war, surging nationalism, climbing interest rates, decline of the old order, a time of despair, frustration and uncertainty among God's children, with its alarming growth in nervous and mental disorders, days of surplus in rich countries, malnutrition in poor, space rockets, and over all the ever-present threat of mass annihilation, a time of dead silence by our House of Bishops and Church generally, a time crying out for guidance, courage, prophecy and counsel, in this tremendous age of peril and opportunity, the Council brought in a report to our last Synod, after a season's work, requesting that the slaughter of animals in packing houses be done in a more human manner!¹⁷¹

With respect to General Synod, AFSA members had not played an important role since 1949.

The reason for AFSA's decline can be related to a loss of energy, specifically to a loss of membership or manpower. This process took two forms: a failure or inability to attract new members and a diaspora of existing members. The first of these was recognized by the writer of *Anglican*

¹⁷⁰. AO 15,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6-7.

¹⁷¹. AO 13,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6.

Outlook's last editorial. He said that it had been hoped that responsibility for the paper would be assumed by "a new ginger group" within the Anglican Church, but this was not possible as no such group existed. "The general attitude among the younger members of our communion appears to us complacently conformist," he said, "and conformity has made our synods so dull that they can hardly last out a day."¹⁷² The failure to attract new members was, no doubt, related to this general accommodation to the *status quo*, as AFSA so clearly represented a non-conformist reaction against the forces dominant in Church and society following the war. It is in this respect, then, that "McCarthyism" can be said to have acted as a force to destroy AFSA. The spirit of the age made participation in such a "cadre" unattractive. One wonders whether or not AFSA appeared to be an anachronism to the younger clergy of the Diocese who did not share the alienation experienced by men, like Flynn Flanagan and Sam Pollard, whose most fundamental understandings of society were shaped earlier in the century. At least it is very likely that, to anyone unfamiliar with the Christian Socialist tradition or the FSCO or the writings of Temple, AFSA was a complete enigma, an utterly foreign and unintelligible phenomenon. Thus as the reactionary mood came to be considered normative, participation in a fellowship rooted in a forgotten openness to creative change ceased even to be considered as a possibility.

Many who have heard about AFSA share a common assumption concerning the group's demise. This "folk history", evolved by oral tradition, holds that Bishop Dixon effectively "got rid of" AFSA, although it does not specify how he did this. There was no clear consensus on Dixon's role among the AFSA members I interviewed. Flynn Flanagan and Sam Pollard stressed his

¹⁷². AO 15,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6.

control of the clergy as the means by which he engineered a decline in AFSA's numbers. Flynn Flanagan said that a number of AFSA clergy were not rectors, but missionary clergy paid directly out of diocesan funds and, therefore, dependent on the bishop for their stipends. He claimed that Dixon denied employment to those priests he wished to remove from the diocese.¹⁷³ Sam Pollard mentioned three priests who may have been denied positions by the bishop. These were: Adolf Sargent, Jack Bishop, and Bernard Harrison. He also said, "If I had gotten stuck, I don't think the bishop would have given me a job."¹⁷⁴ On the other hand, Vince Goring put less emphasis on Dixon's role. His impression of the bishop was that, while he spoke out strongly against AFSA in public, he was not a very strong person and not the most reactionary of the clergy. He said that Dixon had no grounds for barring him or his contemporary in AFSA, John Rowe, from ordination. The only time Dixon mentioned AFSA to Goring was in a pre-ordination interview, when he said that his only concern with him was some of the company he kept. Goring sensed that nobody left the Diocese of Montreal because they had to, but because they felt there were other things they wished to do that were more important than remaining with AFSA in Montreal.¹⁷⁵ This understanding of AFSA's "diaspora" as voluntary, rather than imposed, is accurate in the cases of Percy Powles and Cyril and Marjorie Powles (who left the diocese to work in Japan), Ernie Reed (who became Archdeacon of the Gaspé in 1946), and Vince Goring (who became study secretary of SCM Canada in 1954). They all moved away from Montreal in order to

173. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

174. Interview with Sam Pollard.

175. Interview with Vince Goring.

pursue more interesting and challenging work elsewhere. This may also have been A.G. Elcombe's reason for moving to a hospital chaplaincy in Philadelphia in 1948. With respect to those who left Montreal for parochial work in other dioceses, it is impossible to distinguish whether they did so because of direct pressure from Bishop Dixon, a general sense of discomfort with the situation in Montreal, or an offer of more interesting or better-paid work elsewhere. Some of those who moved to other dioceses were: Jack Bishop (to New Westminster in 1944); M.A. Stephens (to Caledonia in 1949); and Ken Brueton (to Niagara in 1949).

Structurally, Dixon did have control, within certain limits, over the movement of clergy within the diocese. This is one reason why AFSA relied on Flynn Flanagan, a financially independent layman, to speak in Synod. He and Sam Pollard worked in a creative collaboration, as Sam wrote material for Flynn to deliver in debate.¹⁷⁶ The power was certainly available to the bishop, however it is difficult at this point to prove conclusively that Dixon did, in fact, use his authority to deny positions to missionary clergy. Even if he did so, the three cases mentioned by Sam Pollard do not represent a sufficient weakening of numbers to support the claim that the bishop "got rid of" AFSA. It is much more likely that Dixon's role was passive, rather than active. His public opposition to AFSA on controversial issues, as well as the opposition expressed by influential laymen, were probably factors in new priests' decisions not to join AFSA or in existing members' decisions to leave the Diocese of Montreal. It is clear that AFSA did lose members through moves to other parts of the Church. This fact was especially disturbing to Sam Pollard, as he had hoped that AFSA would

¹⁷⁶. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

eventually gain control of the diocese and make it an example of social righteousness to the rest of the Church.¹⁷⁷

One can speculate on other reasons for AFSA's decline in addition to those already mentioned, but these, too, would relate to a lack of energy and resources. It is most likely that, after a decade of the struggle, the members of the group were simply no longer capable of supporting each other to carry on. While the details of AFSA's last days remain, for the time being, somewhat unclear, it can be said in conclusion that the group's decline was abetted by the reactionary mood of the times and the personal needs and decisions of its members.

177. Interview with Sam Pollard.

CHAPTER 3

AFSA's RESPONSE TO ALIENATION

The "Principles" declared in AFSA's Manifesto began with a theological statement affirming that it is God's will that all should live in "brotherhood" and moved to condemnations of the economic system and the Church. This reflects the dual focus of the group. AFSA used its understanding of the Gospel to critique the life of society and it used its critique of society to criticize the Church. In both these movements AFSA expressed a tendency to alienation from the *status quo*. In this chapter we will explore this alienation and reflect on the theological images which informed it.

Alienation from Society

In the Manifesto AFSA condemned the capitalist system because its appeal to self-interest and its promotion of competition frustrated the will of God that all people should live in "brotherhood". This critique was developed in "A Christian Economic System", a pamphlet published by AFSA and written by John Peacock.¹ As Temple had done in *Christianity and Social Order*, AFSA argued for a more just and co-operative economy on the basis of a Christian understanding of human-ness. Peacock wrote that the will of God is "complete justice, love, co-operation and sympathy for all men." The love of God for his creation demands that human personality "be of highest value" and "receive first attention in all matters economic and educational." The economic order, therefore, should be primarily oriented to providing security in the means of survival for all through the equal distribution of wealth.

¹. John Peacock, *A Christian Economic System* ("AFSA Bulletin #1"), Papers of Cyril H. Powles. Unless otherwise noted, quotations in this section are taken from this document.

Peacock wrote,

It is not His will that anyone should suffer so that another might live in luxury, for He loves His children equally. ...So commerce, industry, trade and the professions must be so regulated that the benefits thereof are shared by all according to the needs of each individual, and with some regard as well for those who bear greater responsibility than others.

AFSA hoped that such an equitable distribution would be achieved by a move to a co-operative society in which "a failure of crops in one place would not react against that locality only, but against the entire country and world, and people would be taken care of *according to their need*." In such an interdependent society, the dignity of the person would be recognized and respected, as persons would neither be exploited for the benefit of others nor devalued in the fight for profit.

AFSA condemned capitalism because competition for and the accumulation of profit made impossible such obedience to the will of God. Peacock claimed that selfish economic motives had supplanted the Christian understanding of human-ness and he used the popular maxim, "Business is business", to clarify "the unspoken assumption that business is of the first importance in any economy and that must go on regardless of all else." Because the capitalist economy claims such a primacy for itself and attempts to assert it in ways that are contrary to the divine purpose (e.g., "cut-throat" competition, "its almost universal emphasis on impersonal values", and "its obvious desire, through pressure advertising, to make men covetous."), AFSA concluded that Christianity and capitalism are necessarily in conflict.

Peacock wrote,

No amount of reasoning can reconcile this (Christian) attitude with the dog-eat-dog principle of private and international competition where all personal needs are supplanted by the impersonal ones of gain and profit, for their own sake in many cases, but in most cases for the sake of shareholders.

In proposing an alternative to this unacceptable *status quo*, the AFSA Manifesto declared that "the present social order cannot be changed without a change of heart and mind and will in the individual, and a corresponding change in the political and industrial arrangements."² AFSA never really addressed the issue of personal conversion, and I suspect that this reflects the group's primary reliance on a structural analysis of the Church and society. Indeed, as the group was critical of the individualistic assumptions of capitalism and Protestantism, it is likely that such a reference to personal transformation was merely an ideological safeguard intended to legitimize its advocacy of structural transformation. This explanation is supported by the fact that, with respect to this issue in the Manifesto, AFSA was quoting the Lambeth Conference of 1930, another legitimizing authority. The group's bias is evident in "A Christian Economic System", which identified only structural changes as necessary to bring the economic order into conformity with the will of God. These were: an end to the manipulation of capital for profit and the socialization of the land and natural resources. AFSA maintained that, while money and credit are necessary as media of exchange, they should not be used as a commodity to be bought or sold. Therefore, there should be no interest charged on investment or credit. Similarly, Peacock argued, the raising of capital for new projects should not be dependent on the profitability of the investment, but on the social merit or need for the proposed enterprise. Through the socialization of the land AFSA hoped that it would become possible for all to possess their own homes, "not forever, but for a reasonably long time." Thus, it was argued, the notion of ownership would begin to be re-

2. "Manifesto," Principle 4.

placed by that of tenure, and this would lead to a better understanding of stewardship. If the land and natural resources were "held in trust by the State for the use of all", no one could say "this is mine forever" and assume the freedom to develop or destroy it. Rather, all would be encouraged to co-operate in the care of the earth.

As these two specific proposals suggest, AFSA adopted a socialist stand in response to its alienation from the *status quo*. According to Vince Goring, the members of the group were all socialists in the sense that they "believed the next step in social evolution had to be a society in which the means of production and the land were owned and operated by representatives of the people, that private ownership had to go." This step was seen to be "the basic change that would allow us to move to an economically egalitarian society."³ This common commitment to socialism was not doctrinaire and it took different forms. Some members, such as Flynn Flanagan, were very closely associated with the CCF.⁴ Others were critical of the CCF because they feared that, under pressure, social democrats might move with the Right against other parties farther to the Left.⁵ *Anglican Outlook* voiced such a criticism of the CCF in 1949, saying the party had ceased to represent "an antithetical movement" because of its failure to disassociate itself from the American foreign policy being endorsed by the Liberal government.⁶ Some members, such as Ray Corbett, had strong Communist sympathies.⁷ While

3. Interview with Vince Goring

4. Flynn Flanagan ran for the CCF in Notre-Dame-de-Grace in 1945 and 1958. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

5. Interview with Vince Goring.

6. *AO* 4,12 (Oct. 1949) p.6.

7. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

the group tolerated a plurality of leftist opinion, both the social democrats and the Marxists shared the goal of common ownership.

In advocating such a specific change in the structure of the economy, AFSA was closer to groups like the FCSO, the Guild of St. Matthew, the Church Socialist League, and the Catholic Crusade than it was to groups like the Christian Social Union and the Christendom Group. These latter groups looked to the transformation of values as the fundamental step in the process of social change. AFSA, while basing its critique in the realm of ideas (e.g., the Christian understanding of human-ness), looked primarily to a transformation of economic relationships. Whereas the Christendom Group and, to a certain extent, Malvern had attempted to steer a course between the Scylla of "materialism" and the Charybdis of "idealism", AFSA opted more generally for a materialist analysis of society. This was expressed, with characteristic asperity, by Flynn Flanagan when he said, "Man doesn't live by bread alone -- but by God he's got to have some bread!"⁸ It was this emphasis in its analysis of society which informed AFSA's insistence on the need for changes in the economic structure of society.

William Temple understood the need for structural change, but he also understood better than AFSA did the limitations of such change. In arguing from the standpoint of a Christian doctrine of "man" and in condemning the selfish, competitive basis of capitalism, AFSA reflected the attitudes of Temple and Malvern. AFSA went beyond Malvern in calling specifically for the abolition of private ownership of the land and natural resources and in doing so without qualification, AFSA presented its position less carefully than Temple did. Malvern was unable to be as specific as AFSA

8. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

was on the abolition of private ownership and it qualified and defended its moderate position by claiming that "the church as such can never commit itself to any proposed change in the structure of society as being a self-sufficient means of salvation."⁹ In "A Christian Economic System" Peacock announced that the principles suggested by the Christian doctrine of man "can be logically developed into an economic system which not only works and is Christian but will also happen to bring about the Church's objective in its war on sin, the world and the devil -- God's Kingdom on Earth!"¹⁰ AFSA did not represent "the church as such", but it did identify the Kingdom of God with its particular kind of socialism. While Temple also saw the capitalist system to be based on self-interest and competition, and while he considered this to be contrary to the will of God, he shared Malvern's reservations.¹¹ In his "Appendix" to *Christianity and Social Order*, he was more careful than AFSA was with respect to specific proposals because he understood that, given the power of sin, structural changes such as the elimination of profit and socialization of the land and resources would not necessarily improve the situation. He argued that not all forms of self-interest are bad. For instance, it is appropriate for one to demand the means of fulfilling basic needs for oneself and one's family. He then expressed his reservations on communal ownership as follows:

Our need is to find channels for right self-interest which do not encourage exaggeration of it as our present order does. Communal ownership would entirely

9. "The Findings, Malvern" as reprinted in CSS, *Bulletin*, #103S (Feb. 25, 1941) p.6.

10. Peacock, "A Christian Economic System."

11. See, Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, p.27.

close one channel to it and open others -- especially the road to the bureaucratic aristocracy which is an evident feature of the Russian system. The art of Government is not to devise what would be the best system for saints to work, but to secure that the lower motives actually found among men prompt that conduct which the higher motives demand.¹²

AFSA's proposals do not reflect this depth of analysis of the human situation. One cannot dispute the fact that the group expressed valid concerns for the economic life of Canada, and in advocating the value of human personality and the principles of equal distribution and co-operative effort, AFSA was well within its scope as a group of concerned Christians. On the other hand, AFSA was perhaps naive in offering such specific proposals and in commenting on the possibilities of their implementation. This judgement is not made from an economic or ideological point of view. Rather, AFSA's naiveté in this respect is theological and it relates to a superficial understanding of sin and the Kingdom. In many ways, the subtleties of its British antecedents were lost on AFSA. The group failed to appreciate the wisdom behind Malvern's reservations with respect to the Kingdom and Temple's reservations with respect to sin in relation to socialism and communal ownership. Another example of this lack of depth is provided in Peacock's reference to the maxim "Business is business".¹³ He used it to describe the prevalence of the profit motive whereas Temple used it as an example of the dis-integration or compartmentalization of Western society which divorced religion, politics, and economics.¹⁴

The lack of refinement in AFSA's argument for socialism should be considered a reflection of the primacy of its concern for the Church. The

12. *Ibid.*, p.102

13. Peacock, "A Christian Economic System."

14. William Temple, *Nature, Man and God* (London: MacMillan, 1960) p.77.

group's purpose was to argue for what they perceived to be fundamentally Christian and in advocating socialism as Christian, AFSA was passing judgement on the Church's accommodation to an unchristian social order. The missing element in the argument was a description of the effects of capitalism -- the ways it denies human personality and its failure to provide for the basic needs of people. This was the basis of Peacock's judgement that capitalism is unchristian, and it is a much more powerful argument than the attempt to prove that socialism is essentially "of the Lord."

Alienation from the Church

With respect to the Church, AFSA's critique and vision were more fully developed. That this was the group's area of primary concern, to which it devoted most of its energies, is obvious from both the volume and the quality of the material written.

AFSA's critique of the Church was related to one fundamental insight: that "The Church is the handmaiden of society."¹⁵ The group considered the Church of England in Canada to be overly-accommodated to the ruling interests of a post-Christian capitalist society. Sam Pollard said that the Church had become "the tool of the rich and powerful, and failed to be the friend of the poor and dispossessed."¹⁶ Because of her attention to the needs of business, the Church had lost "the masses" and had become a class Church.¹⁷ Cyril Powles was describing the attitude of "contemporary man" to the Church when he wrote,

15. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

16. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task", *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) p.99.

17. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1946) pp.9f.

To him the Church means compromise with the power of this world: siding with the haves against the have-nots; with capital against labour; with white against colour; with imperialism against self-determination; in short with all the characteristics which our Lord condemned as belonging to the rulers of the Gentiles, and not to his friends.¹⁸

This classist bondage was attacked by AFSA on the grounds that it made the Church unfaithful to its mission and its Lord. According to Sam Pollard, the Body of Christ ought to be "the ferment and dynamite in any social structure", but commercial interests had ensured that the Church would be "content to sanctify the activities of the state and of the 'free individual'."¹⁹ The Gospel had been "sold out".

Given this understanding of the Church's function in sustaining the *status quo*, AFSA members were probably not surprised that official resistance to the discussion of unpopular opinions and the implementation of progressive programmes was defended with arguments based on an uncritical and individualistic understanding of the role of faith. Flynn Flanagan said that the "chief aim" of AFSA's opponents was "to restore religious individualism."²⁰ The establishment sought to safe-guard its position by maintaining that religion was primarily a matter of individual decision, personal piety, and inter-personal morality. This tactic on the part of "the opposition" prompted Ray Corbett to comment that the dominance of wealthy businessmen on the boards of the Church explained why "the church is so silent on all social questions except for an occasional splutter about some of the 'naughty'

18. Cyril Powles, "Christianity -- A Living Organism", *AO* 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.6.

19. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task", *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) pp.99-100.

20. Flynn Flanagan, "Reflections on the meetings at Fort William", *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.15.

things people do in the careless pursuit of their freedoms."²¹ The basic contradiction in the establishment's religiosity was eloquently exposed by Sam Pollard, when he wrote,

It would seem to be glaring hypocrisy vehemently to urge that venereal disease is a moral problem first and a medical one second -- and at the same time to confess that "lending money at interest" is a financial problem first and a moral problem second (if at all).²²

AFSA addressed the ideological roots of the Church's classism by affirming that the Gospel is "essentially social,"²³ and that "there is no problem in community life that is not, at base, a theological one."²⁴ In criticising a society founded on the idea of the "individual", AFSA became critical of "the atomistic conception of Christianity" and asserted that "Christianity is a social religion."²⁵ This view was developed by John Kirby in a series entitled, "The Church -- A Family."²⁶ Quoting Emil Brunner, Kirby said that the Good News comes to us "not in the imperative mood but in the indicative," proclaiming "the nature of God, man and the material world" in terms of "is" rather than "ought". Part of the Gospel message concerns the essential solidarity of human life: that we are branches of the same vine, sheep of the

21. Ray Corbett, "Lay Representation at Synod", *AO* 6,3 (Jan. 1951) p.11

22. Sam Pollard, "The Diocesan Social Service Council and 'The Social Gospel'", *Montreal Churchman*, (July, 1944) p.20.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Flynn Flanagan, "Reflections on the meetings at Fort William" *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.14.

25. See *AO* 4,7 (May, 1947) p.17; 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.6; 7,7 (May, 1952) p.6.

26. *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.8; 5,6 (April, 1950) p.17; 5,8 (June, 1947) p.9; 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9

same shepherd, and members one of another. This human solidarity should find its fullest expression in the community of the Spirit. Kirby affirmed that the church is a family and its role in the world is to be the prototype of human solidarity, "to express on earth the pattern of the Common Life which is laid up in heaven." AFSA believed that, in the Incarnation, God had revealed the essentially corporate nature of human being and that the church, as the Body of Christ in the world, was called to re-present this revelation in the world by its example. For this reason, an individual faith is impossible. Faith in the Lord of the church necessarily involves participation with the community of believers in its mission in the world. Given its conviction that the existing order did not reflect the Common Life, AFSA held that, in order to fulfill its representative role, the Church would have to turn away from the *status quo*. An editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

What we need most at this time is a church deeply aware of the "cosmic setting of man's moral and spiritual struggle" and prepared to live a communal life that is entirely unlike the ordinary life of this world.²⁷

As long as the Church remained in bondage to a competitive social order based on self-interest, so long would it fail to embody the brotherhood revealed by its Lord.

These views on the essentially social nature of personhood and the representative, almost sacramental, role of the church formed the apologetic for AFSA's demand that the economic and political life of the institutional Church should be radically different from that of capitalist society. Human community should be most evident in the Church, and as the unity of persons is

²⁷. AO 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.6.

denied in the *status quo*, the Church must stand over and against it. However, given that the Church was so deeply involved in the practices of capitalism, it was essential, as a matter of faithfulness to its mission, that the life of the Church be reformed. Sam Pollard wrote,

A Church whose practice is at such variance with its professed beliefs is split spiritually and must inevitably disintegrate, ... This situation can only be resolved in one of two ways -- either we revolutionize our practice in order to bring practice into line with our beliefs, our theories; or we throw over the Christian theories altogether and reduce them to the level of present practice.²⁸

AFSA called the Church to "become what it is" by reforming its political, economic, and worshipping life and making them reflect better the life of true community. Politically, AFSA supported strongly the synodical system of Church government and attempted to secure a wider representation of all classes of the laity on the Church's official boards and committees. Economically, AFSA challenged the Church to examine its financial supports, advocated a basic stipend, and criticized the attempt to strengthen the actuarial pension plan.

An implication of AFSA's understanding of true community was the sense that all persons had the right to participate in decisions which affected the whole. Therefore, AFSA reacted against the limitation of open discussion in Church meetings and other trends which seemed to contribute to an erosion of collective decision-making and "democratic" government in the church. On the national level, there were periodic suggestions that General Synod meet less frequently with a "reduced and less heterogenous membership." At the 1943 General Synod in Toronto, there had been an attempt to pare the

²⁸. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) p.10.

Lower House, consisting of priests and laity, from 286 to 186, to convene every four years instead of every three, and to reduce diocesan representation to the three boards of the Church: the Missionary Society of the Church in Canada (MSCC), the General Board of Religious Education (GBRE), and the Council for Social Service (CSS).²⁹ Similar concerns were being expressed in 1949 and 1952.³⁰ In such attempts AFSA perceived a tendency to concentrate power in the Executive of General Synod and it was felt that this would only lead to "further bureaucratic control and more government by decree and the so called experts."³¹ In the argument for such change on the basis of economic and administrative considerations, AFSA discerned a "worship of financial efficiency and bureaucratic centralization at the expense of the cure of souls."³² Beginning in 1945, similar trends to "clerical Fascism" were perceived in attempts at Diocesan Synod to control the activities of synod committees and to limit the discussion of controversial subjects. For instance, it was suggested that Diocesan Synod meet every two years.³³ In 1946 a motion was introduced which would have prohibited committees of Synod from issuing any public statements or taking any public action which had not been approved by the bishop. Ernie Reed said this would have amounted to episcopal censorship and a deviation from

29. Sam Pollard, "Comments on General Synod", *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1943) p.20; *AO* 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6.

30. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments I, By 'An Observer'" *AO* (Nov. 1949) p.12; R.H. Corbett, "A Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", *AO* 2 (Dec. 1949) p.10; "Arteriosclerosis", *AO* 7,11 (Sept. 1952) p.7.

31. *AO*, 7,11 (Sept. 1952) p.7.

32. *AO*, 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6.

33. "Synod Trends", *AO*, 6,6 (April, 1951) p.8.

the Anglican norm.³⁴ In a similar vein, an editorial in *Anglican Outlook* protested in 1950 that the bishop's authority as the chairman of Synod was being misused. This article said,

We deny that we have party government in the church, but we have steadily and carefully built up the prestige and power of the president-bishop of synod in order that he may speak for the ruling elite within the church.³⁵

Another example of hierarchical control was the procedural change made in 1950 which barred the presentation of motions from the floor of Synod without the unanimous consent of the delegates.³⁶ This was seen to confine the power to initiate discussion with the administration who set the agenda and to limit the ordinary members of Synod to asking questions or making comments from the floor.

There are indications that AFSA understood these trends in slightly different ways. Its fundamental analysis was that democratic decision-making in the Church was being destroyed, but this was variously attributed to a general trend in society to limit free discussion,³⁷ to a "power play" on the part of ruling elites,³⁸ and, more specifically, to a move to "muzzle" minority groups within the Church.³⁹ All of these are valid interpretations, but it should be noted that the latter was certainly the

34. Reported in Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments", *Montreal Churchman*, (Aug. 1946) pp.8f.

35. "The Episcopal Veto", *AO* 5,6 (April 1950) p.7.

36. "Memorials and Petitions", *AO* 5,9 (June, 1950) pp.6f.

37. "Here I stand", *AO* 6,10 (Aug. 1951) pp.7f.

38. "Memorials and Petitions", *AO* 5,9 (June, 1950) p.6.

39. "Here I Stand", *AO* 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.7.

case in the Diocese of Montreal. Restrictions on the presentation of motions from the floor of Synod and the episcopal censorship of public pronouncements were introduced to control AFSA members' activities.⁴⁰ In defence, AFSA called for the free discussion and representative government of democracy and, quoting Bishop Gore, argued that the early church "was in fact the very nursery and the home of the principles of representative government."⁴¹ Quite apart from its ideological or apologetic function in the face of repressive opposition, this respect for democracy was a reflection of the group's understanding of "brotherhood". As baptised Christians, all members of the Church share an equal status as children of the Lord and each has the right to speak and to be heard by his family.⁴²

AFSA used this perspective to address the Church's bondage to the rich and powerful. Through the *Anglican Outlook*, the group noted that lay representation to General Synod and Diocesan Synod was "not really representative of our church people,"⁴³ as the majority of delegates were businessmen and professionals. Sam Pollard wrote.

When the vast majority of the laity, the common labourers, the artisans, the factory-hands, and the junior white collar people are hardly represented on the floor of general synod -- and not at all on the executive council or committees -- how can anyone with honesty argue that the church today is not a class institution in the hands

40. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

41. Quoted in "The Episcopal Veto", *AO* 6,5 (April, 1950) p.7.

42. On AFSA's perceptions of trends in church government, see also, Sam Pollard, "Synod Reflections", *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1945) p.16 and "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) pp.8f.

43. *AO* 7,12 (Oct. 1952) p.6.

of the privileged few who direct its policy, control its manpower and handle its finances?⁴⁴

The same was considered to be the case with respect to Diocesan Synod, and since 1943, AFSA members had been calling for changes in the timing and financing of Synod which would allow working people to attend.⁴⁵ Although some progress was made in this direction in Montreal,⁴⁶ AFSA was still advocating these reforms in 1951.⁴⁷

AFSA also addressed the Church's accommodation to capitalism as this was expressed in her financial organization. In this area the group was much more on the offensive than it was with respect to freedom of speech in synods. Whereas AFSA's arguments in defense of the synodical system were, at least in part, a response to actions taken against it, the groups's positive advocacy of financial responsibility and the basic stipend were a direct consequence of its notion of human solidarity. That AFSA should relate the economy of the Church to the value of community is not surprising, given its tendency to employ a materialist or structuralist analysis of society. However, to most of its audience, fixed in a tacit separation of spirituality and material existence, this concern for financial reform must have appeared somewhat extraneous to the Church's mission. Sam Pollard attempted to clarify this relationship when he wrote,

44. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.12. See also, *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4; *AO* 7,9 (Aug-Sept. 1952) p.7.

45. *SDMJP* 1943, pp.100f.

46. *Ibid.*

47. Ray Corbett, "Lay Representation at Synod", *AO* 6,3 (Jan. 1951) p.11.

The values of the Gospel are not those of the commercial world; and if we are to persuade men to accept the message of the Cross our behaviour in the ordinary things of life should be equally extraordinary. As Christ's witnesses we have to commend the Faith by our faith and by living a sacrificial Christian life -- not by following an ecclesiastical system that is based almost entirely on the philosophy of power and a commercial way of life.⁴⁸

He also said,

Until the church reorganizes her own economy with courage and integrity, and makes it conform to Christian values -- and not to the standards of the secular world -- just so long shall we be defeating our own purposes in winning souls to Christ.⁴⁹

AFSA believed that the Church's witness was "vitally affected" by the way it organized its business, and that, given the ecclesiastical *status quo*, there was needed "an economic reform which will be a sacrament of spiritual purpose."⁵⁰

Perhaps the clearest and least debatable example of the Church's participation in and perpetuation of the capitalist system was the fact that the Church was a shareholder, collecting profit on investments. AFSA did not even attempt to criticise the fact of investment. Rather, acknowledging or assuming that the Church would always have capital to invest, AFSA asked that the Church become a socially responsible investor, attending to the policies, wages, and working conditions of those companies in which she held shares. On this issue, Sam Pollard again quoted Bishop Gore, who had written,

... it seems to me a conspicuous instance of moral blindness that people should fail to see that in

48. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) p.10.

49. *Ibid.*, p.9.

50. Sam Pollard, "The Diocesan Social Service Council and 'The Social Gospel'", *Montreal Churchman* (July 1944) p.21.

investing their money they make themselves -- within reasonable limits, but really -- responsible for the use to which their money is put: that to put one's money, or allow it to be put, into any 'concern' without enquiry into the moral or social tendency of the concern is to serve mammon at the expense of Christ.⁵¹

AFSA also called the Church to transfer investments from "big business corporations" to consumer and producer cooperatives, saying that "Christians must materialize their ideals by putting their financial resources into agencies that work for a basic re-ordering of our economic life."⁵² The members of the group advocated such a "purification of the Church's means of support" in both Diocesan and General Synods.⁵³

The financial reform to which AFSA devoted most of its energies and with which the group has become most closely identified was the institution of one basic stipend with allowances. While AFSA produced much material on this issue,⁵⁴ its arguments were quite simple. The unequal remuneration of the clergy was an obvious "negation of the idea of Christian brotherhood."⁵⁵ By paying larger stipends and better benefits to priests in wealthier parishes, the Church encouraged in the clergy the self-interest and competition typical

51. Quoted in Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments", *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

52. *Ibid.*

53. See, e.g., *SDMJP* 1943, pp.100f., and Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 2,3 (Jan. 1947) p.17.

54. See *Montreal Churchman*, (Oct. 1943) p.8; Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4; John O. Peacock, "The Problem of the Basic Stipend", *CSS Bulletin* #137, (Oct. 30, 1948) pp.8-12; "The Basic Stipend", *AO* 4,5 (March, 1949) pp.8-10; R.H. Corbett, "A Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", *AO* 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12; J.E. DeWolf, "Clergy Basic Stipend", *AO* 5,7 (May, 1950) pp.10-11 and 5,8 (June, 1950) pp.16-17; Letter from R.H. Corbett, "The Right or Wrong of Basic Stipend", *AO* 11,8 (Sept, 1950) p.15; and J.O. Peacock, "Basic Stipend", *AO* 11,8 (June-July, 1956) p.16. Cf. The pamphlet circulated by the Basic Stipend Committee of General Synod and reprinted in *AO* 15,2 (Dec. 1959) pp.8f and 15,3 (Jan. 1960) pp.8f.

55. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman* (April 1946) p.9.

of secular society which denied the Gospel's vision of community. It was hoped that the basic stipend would overcome "competition and rivalry for position and material benefit" and foster among the clergy an unconditional commitment to the work of the Kingdom of God.⁵⁶ An editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

The Plan's proponents believe that, under such conditions as the Plan envisages, the Clergy would truly reflect the lives of the Apostles in that "they would have everything in common", and that their witness would show the laity a living example of the moral soundness and efficacy of Christ's teaching to "bear one another's burdens."⁵⁷

AFSA also argued for the basic stipend on the basis of efficiency. While it was admitted that competition for higher positions might be considered appropriate in business, it was not appropriate to the ministry. Describing the effects of the existing system, Ray Corbett said,

(It) results in those areas which are poor in money but rich in people being either poorly shepherded or not shepherded at all, while rich parishes in many areas have more clergy than they actually need. There is something basically wrong when we of the church ask a man to work in a mission area on \$1400 to \$1600 per year, spending from \$300 to \$900 of that on a car to cover a vast area, while his brother minister in the city gets three or four times that amount and in addition sometimes has a secretary, travel allowance, a fairly well-contained parish and a curate. Surely those who are dedicated to the same Master need no financial incentives in front of them to work hard: surely it is not Christian or practicable for one man to lack the tools with which to do his job while another has enough surplus to travel thousands of miles visit (sic) the Mission areas only to go duck hunting.⁵⁹

⁵⁶. John O. Peacock, "The Problem of the Basic Stipend," CSS, *Bulletin* #137, pp.10-11.

⁵⁷. AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

⁵⁸. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.10.

⁵⁹. R.H. Corbett, "Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", AO 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12.

Under the basic stipend plan, all funds designated for salaries and benefits would be pooled and redistributed according to a schedule of allowances for family, transportation, years of service, and, possibly, accommodation and the difficulty of the particular ministry.⁶⁰ It was hoped that by distributing funds on the basis of need, priests might be better enabled to fulfill their ministries.

The institution of such a system was a fundamental part of AFSA's programme as announced in the Manifesto.⁶¹ The issue was raised initially in Diocesan Synod in 1943, but the scheme was never approved by that body. Representatives of the Diocese of Montreal presented a motion on basic stipend to General Synod in 1943 and a committee was appointed. Continuation of the committee was voted at each successive General Synod but no specific action toward the implementation of the plan was taken.

The strongest opposition to the scheme was seen to originate, not with the clergy, but with influential laymen.⁶² John Peacock wrote,

They pay certain large sums of money into the church coffers and they demand proportionate services in return. They pay, so they want to get! They think that if they pay five thousand dollars a year to the salary of their rector then they ought to be able to "employ a five thousand dollar man."⁶³

AFSA did not "blame" the wealthy congregations and their priests for the

60. There was also a suggestion that the plan might include lay workers. On this and other variations, see Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", pp.11f.

61. Rule 5 of the Manifesto read: "To work for a system of clerical stipends based upon the Christian doctrine of brotherhood."

62. See *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.9 and AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

63. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.11.

situation; the competitive system of stipends was "a corporate sin and responsibility."⁶⁴ AFSA also recognized economic security as a legitimate concern, but was not content to settle for an expedient or crisis-related solution to the problem. For this reason, the group resisted attempts to establish special funds for the poorer clergy. This might give the rural priest a degree of security approaching that of a priest in a wealthy urban congregation but it would not give him an equal status. Of such suggestions *Anglican Outlook* said,

These are most worthy plan (sic) indeed, but one cannot help wondering whether their introduction at a time of agitation for Basic Stipend was accidental or inspired, or a combination of both. In our present disordered arrangements, such plans can serve a pressing need, BUT THEY CANNOT REMOVE THE BASIC CONTRADICTIONS in the present system, though perhaps they will obscure them for a while longer. The crumbs may be a little bigger, but they will still be crumbs, and from the usual source.⁶⁵

AFSA was not willing to lay responsibility for the *status quo* entirely at the feet of the rich and powerful, nor was it willing to allow a charitable solution to the problems to circumvent the fundamental issue of brotherhood.

A further problem encountered in the struggle to implement the basic stipend was a general ignorance of the practicability and benefits of the plan. AFSA pointed to examples of such systems in foreign mission work, in the pension funds of some Dioceses, and in six Dioceses in Southern Africa.⁶⁶ The benefits would be a better sense of brotherhood among the clergy and greater efficiency in the use of the Church's human resources. Not only

^{64.} *Ibid.*

^{65.} AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

^{66.} *Ibid.*, pp.9-10

would priests be bound together economically, "sharing one another's burdens", but the social inequalities among the clergy would begin to be diminished as the inferiority or pride felt by priests because of their charges would begin to change.⁶⁷ Without the usual financial considerations, clergy would be much more mobile and could be placed according to their gifts for a particular ministry.⁶⁸ Depending on the size of the area participating in the plan, bishops could more easily move men, not only within a diocese, but between dioceses.⁶⁹ It was also likely that rural ministry would improve, as the incentive for effective priests to move to the city for a better living would be removed.⁷⁰ John Peacock said that priests would begin to receive their paychecks regularly and on time, freed from fluctuations in parish funds and the time constraints of treasurers.⁷¹

A final benefit of the scheme would have been greater fidelity to Christian truth and a more prophetic ministry. The existing system of stipends was seen to discourage the clergy from assuming unpopular or controversial stands on critical issues. Competition among priests fostered a tendency to "sell out" the Gospel as "getting ahead" depended on coming to the attention of and making an impression upon the rich and powerful laymen who served on the selection committees of the wealthy parishes. AFSA felt the basic stipend would free the clergy to speak according to conviction

67. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.12.

68. *Ibid.*, pp.11-12.

69. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", AO 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4.

70. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend" p.12.

71. *Ibid.*

and proclaim the Gospel without regard for the social class of the parish.⁷² Furthermore, the Church's adoption of such a cooperative plan would be a judgement on and witness to capitalist society, for it would proclaim that the life of the Kingdom is radically different from the life of the world.⁷³

AFSA also debated issues of economic security with respect to the Pension Fund. General Synod had established its pension system in the late nineteenth century. It was apparently based on early actuarial principles and, in AFSA's day, it incorporated the clergy from all but six dioceses.⁷⁴ During the 'forties, problems with clergy pensions, especially eligibility and the poor stipends involved, were widely felt.⁷⁵ Shortly after its appearance, *Anglican Outlook* noted the need "to do something rational and generous about the chaotic absurdity of pensions throughout the Church."⁷⁶ About the same time, AFSA began to speak to the pension issue. Firstly, the group felt it was inappropriate for the clergy to claim greater economic security than Canadians in general, "as though any true prophet of the Lord ever cared about securities, apart from the security of all men."⁷⁷ AFSA advocated social security as an alternative and rejoiced that the day was coming when the community as a whole would take responsibility for the care of the aged. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

72. AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.8

73. *Ibid.*

74. See AO 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 8,1 (Nov. 1952) p.4.

75. For an example of the problems involved, see CC (Oct. 15, 1942) p.581; (Oct. 22, 1942) p.597; (Oct. 29, 1942) p.613; (Nov. 12, 1942) p.646; (Dec. 3, 1942) pp.695f; (Dec. 24, 1942) p.755.

76. AO 1,15 (June 1, 1946) p.9.

77. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends," *Montreal Churchman* (April 1946) p.9.

We have long prophesied that the real solution in our society is a statutory contributory pension plan for all citizens, whether clergymen, or artisans, or lawyers, or doctors; ...⁷⁸

This hope, that the ministers of the Kingdom would so identify with others in society, was a reflection of the group's understanding of human solidarity.

AFSA also thought it was inappropriate that some clergy should have greater security than others. Since 1934, pensions had been based on the principle of "equal pension for equal years of service".⁷⁹ When wealthy parishes, such as St. Matthias in Westmount, established private annuities for their rectors, AFSA saw their actions to be an indication of the inadequacies of the existing pension plans and "a mockery of the corporately acknowledged principle of equal pensions for equal years of service."⁷⁹ The group understood the provision of pensions to be a corporate responsibility and believed that the inadequacies in the system should be overcome for all and not only for those who had "succeeded" in securing a wealthy parish.

Finally, AFSA resisted some attempts to reform the Pension Fund. These reforms were intended to improve the system and increase the stipend paid. AFSA was sympathetic to these goals, but argued that the way in which they were being pursued would deny the brotherhood of the priesthood. One plan, suggested in 1943, would have paid a pension commensurate with the contributions made by the individual clergyman. AFSA resisted this because it would simply have accentuated the existing inequalities in stipends.⁸⁰ Another

78. "Our Pension Empire", AO 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.6. See also, AO 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 7,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1952) pp.7f.

79. "Pension Eschatology", AO 6,6 (April, 1951) p.6; see also, AO 5,5 (March, 1950) p.6.

80. See AO 5,2 (Dec. 1949) p.9.

solution sought to make the fund more sound actuarially. AFSA considered this to be another instance of the intrusion of capitalist principles into the life of the Church. The group argued against actuarial soundness because: first, it was folly to assume that the Church might "go out of business" and be obligated to pay accrued liability; second, its inflexible rates of return did not allow the community to respond to emergencies, such as illness, and so depersonalized and dehumanized what ought to be a caring act of corporate responsibility; and third, while a firmer actuarial basis might improve the pensions of those still in active service and contributing to the fund, it would do nothing to improve the situation of those currently retired and dependent upon an inadequate pension. AFSA believed that the Church, if it were to reflect the brotherhood sanctified by its Lord, should adopt a "pay as you go" or budget-based system whereby pensions would be raised annually and the retired members of the community would be supported directly by the others.⁸¹

AFSA's arguments in response to the political and economic organization of the Church were based on the group's particular understanding of human community revealed in the Gospel. As the Church adopted the practices of capitalism and its infrastructure betrayed a strong tendency to support the *status quo*, the Church failed to embody the life of brotherhood proclaimed by Jesus. As we have already noted, AFSA also perceived this tendency to accommodation in the dominant understanding of the faith. Not only had the Church become tied to the economic and political interests of the rich

⁸¹. See AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.5; 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12; 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.6; 7,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1952) pp.3f.

and powerful, she was seen to have altered her teaching as well. This ideological bondage was most evident in the theological dependency on the notion of the person as an autonomous individual. AFSA extended its critique of the Church to include the ways in which contemporary liturgical practices confirmed and perpetuated this bondage, denying the corporate nature of faith and worship. The group's attitude to worship was expressed architecturally in Roland Bodger's church, St. Cuthbert's, dedicated in 1948. The building was of cruciform design with the altar at the crossing and the congregation on three sides. As *Anglican Outlook* reported, "the purpose of this arrangement is to emphasize the central part which the Lord's Supper ought to play in all Christian living and working."⁸² By placing the altar in the middle of the building and having the members of the congregation facing each other, the design of St. Cuthbert's presented a sacramental and social faith. AFSA realized, however, that the Sunday worship of most Anglican churches failed in its recognition of one or both of these elements. It failed to be sacramental in the most obvious sense that it was often not eucharistic. Most churches of the day held Holy Communion at eight o'clock every Sunday and at the major service only once or twice a month. Some AFSA members favoured a weekly "Parish Communion" or "People's Eucharist" held at an hour when the majority could attend and make their communion.⁸³ The Sunday worship of most parishes failed to be social in the corporate sense because it tended to emphasize personal communion with God. AFSA claimed that the popular understanding of worship was

⁸². AO 3,7 (May 1948) pp.3f. Cf. *Montreal Churchman* (May 1946) pp.3f.

⁸³. Cf. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9.

individualistic. John Peacock said, "In these services, regardless of outward form, the appeal is to the individual person -- a person *gets* something from the service, for *himself*."⁸⁴ In the liturgy, the laity did not experience themselves as the people of God, but as individual Christians engaged in an act of personal restoration. John Kirby said, "most congregations look upon themselves as a number of individuals saying their prayers in a public place."⁸⁵ The practice of private baptism provided a clear example and possible explanation of the problem. John Kirby wrote,

Public baptism has become the exception rather than the rule: while most baptisms take place in a Church building, very few take place in the church, i.e. in the presence of the family of God. If one of the meanings of baptism is incorporation into the Christian family, surely the custom of baptizing children at a private ceremony is something that should be forbidden except in case of emergency. We have so lost sight of the corporate nature of Christianity that we think of baptism solely in terms of the child and not in terms of the community life which ought to follow from baptism. Here, where we could make an effective attack on the rampant individualism which bedevils the church, by publicly receiving the child into the family of God, we have gone the way of the world and imported individualism into the beginning of the Christian life itself. We could probably do more to help Christians realize that the purpose of the church is to draw men out of isolation into the divine community by taking the font out of obscurity than by any other way.⁸⁶

The Eucharist was seen to be the act of community in which the personal and corporate, the individual and social achieved their synthesis.⁸⁷

⁸⁴. AO 7,12 (Oct. 1952) p.12.

⁸⁵. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9.

⁸⁶. AO 5,6 (April, 1950) p.17

⁸⁷. Cf., AO 2,5 (March, 1947) p.4.

The Church as an Agent of Social Transformation

In the previous section I outlined some of the particular criticisms of the Church made by AFSA. The group called the Church to witness to the life of true community by reforming its political and economic organization. The group was also critical of the ways in which the worship of the Church supported the individualism which underlay its accommodation to the *status quo*. AFSA also hoped, however, that the Church would move beyond this simple disengagement from capitalism to address the critical issues of the day and become a positive force for social change. In effect, the group called upon the Church to adopt a different, pro-active, role.

AFSA noted the vigour with which the decision-making bodies of the Church avoided the controversy that would accompany a discussion of relevant social issues. An example was General Synod's failure to discuss the atom bomb in 1946.⁸⁸ The official Church found a defense for its irrelevance in the claim that the Body of Christ can never be identified with any political or economic system, and it could quote Malvern for support. AFSA, on the other hand, understood this reluctance to address critical issues to be a function of the Church's accommodation⁸⁹ and attempted to expose this ideological bias by pointing to the Church's support of the NATO pact.⁹⁰ If the official Church intended to remain free of secular affiliations, should it not, then, disassociate itself from Western capitalism? Sam Pollard used the opposition's argument against them and stressed disaffiliation from the

88. See, Sam Pollard, "Comments on the Sixteenth General Synod," *Montreal Churchman* (Nov. 1946) p.10 and AO 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.11.

89. Cf. AO 3,12 (Oct. 1948) p.9

90. AO 5,2 (Dec. 1949) p.7.

status quo for the sake of a changed social order. He wrote,

The Christian can have few regrets over the destruction of any system; his great care and interest must be for future arrangements. This task will naturally bring tension; but surely the church is a dialectical organism, full of tensions, and we must be less squeamish, less politic and less expedient -- and much more forthright in word and deed.⁹¹

The Church's irrelevance was also seen to be a function of its individualistic approach to reality, another aspect of its accommodation to capitalism. In writing about a particular report to General Synod in 1946, Sam Pollard said that "there seems to be not the faintest realization that sin is social as well as personal, that it is embodied in the structure as well as the individual."⁹² AFSA hoped to move the Church toward a more vocal role in society and one which would support systemic change. Sam Pollard believed that the Church's charitable work in the community gave it the right to "thunder at the gates of tyranny."⁹³ He wrote,

Shall the Church confine itself to ambulance work -- picking up the derelicts of the ruthless competitive order to give them charity, and fail to co-operate with policies of governments or public bodies trying to substitute social justice for social injustice? Too often in the past the Church has -- I think -- taken less pains to prevent than to relieve poverty, and the duty of assisting the poor has been rather an exercise in charity than an obligation in justice.⁹⁴

Instead of "staunching the wounds of an acquisitive society"⁹⁵ the Church

91. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

92. *AO* 2,2 (Dec. 1946) pp.19f.

93. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

94. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task," *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) p.99.

95. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

should take an educational and activist role in promoting the cause of social justice. So AFSA hoped that the Church would begin, not only to reflect mutuality in its own life, but to advocate it in society as a whole. The role of the Church, expressed theologically, was to be the agent of redemption by which the sovereignty of God is extended over the creation. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

... the church as the Body of Christ must be His instrument for the "fulfillment of God's purpose in the world and beyond it." And since God's Kingdom cannot be created in a vacuum it must have something to say about the social and economic environment in which God's children live and move and have their being.⁹⁶

The Church, AFSA believed, was to be the means by which divine power affects the material relationships of persons and recreates the world.

AFSA did not specify how the Church was to fulfill this role. However, if one can consider the actions of the group to reflect its vision of the Church, then the Church was expected to work for a new social order by speaking boldly to the issues of the day from a Christian perspective and by aligning itself with other progressive and alienated groups in society. AFSA did describe the kind of liturgical life which ought to support and represent this role. The group believed that the worship of the Church failed to be social and sacramental in a much deeper sense than that which we have already described. The popular understanding and common practice of liturgy failed to be social in that it ignored the life of society and it failed to be sacramental in that it tended to spiritualize the Gospel by divorcing the spiritual and material realms of existence. Thus the Eucharist was seen by most Anglicans to be more of an act of the individual soul in relationship to the divine. AFSA, on the other hand, viewed the Eucharist as a

⁹⁶. "Where it Listeth...", *AO* 6,8 (June, 1951) p.6.

corporate act of the people of God on behalf of all persons in which the life of society was offered to God and transformed. The group believed the church's worship was closely related to the political, economic, and social relationships of everyday life.

The key to this view of the Eucharist is an implicit understanding of redemption as the process of re-ordering the chaos of a sinful world and a particular interpretation of the offertory. These were put forward by John Kirby in a series on "The Worship of the Church" in *Anglican Outlook*.⁹⁷ In these articles, Kirby described worship as the recognition of God as sovereign and sin as the absence of this acknowledgement. Chaos was seen to be the consequence of sin. Kirby wrote,

When man fails or refuses to recognize God as the Creator and ultimate Owner of the universe and attempts to run the world without reference to Him and to His laws, chaos results. ... With the widespread non-recognition of God and of God's laws in our time, man has moved steadily towards his own destruction; instead of realizing the glorious heritage of freedom which is his as a child of God, he has moved increasingly in the direction of slavery, slavery to race and blood, slavery to the state, slavery to the industrial machine. It is only in the acknowledgement of the God from whom we come, that man can ever achieve the freedom for which the Creator made him.⁹⁸

Through the Incarnation, God was bringing order to the world's disorder and in the Eucharist, this process of redemption was extended symbolically. The bread and wine were considered the product of human labour expended on the creation and, therefore, representative of the whole life of society and the sinful, disordered relationship which informs it.⁹⁹ In the offertory

⁹⁷. John C. Kirby, "The Worship of the Church", *AO* 1,9 (March 1, 1946) to 2,1 (Nov. 1946)

⁹⁸. *AO* 1,9 (March 1, 1946) p.19.

⁹⁹. Cf. John C. Kirby, "The Laity and the Liturgy", *AO* 8,8 (June-July 1953) p.15.

then, the church was seen to be offering up to God the economic, political, and social life of the world with all its ambiguities and sinfulness. Kirby understood the imperfection of the bread and wine on several levels when he wrote,

Our Offering has in it the Sins of the Individual, his selfishness, his pride, his apathy, and all the rest.
Our Offering has in it the Sins of the Church, her faithlessness (sic), her worldliness, her cowardice, her compromise, and all the rest.
Our Offering has in it the Sins of Society, its oppression, its corruption, injustice, and all the rest.¹⁰⁰

In the Consecration, as the bread and wine are transformed and become vehicles of Christ's presence, the ambiguous life of the world is transformed and conformed to God's order. This process was considered the extension of the Incarnation, for in the world-made-flesh, God had assumed matter for a spiritual purpose, the redemption of the world. In the Eucharist, God assumed the material elements of bread and wine, making them the means of Christ's presence among his people and symbols of his new creation.¹⁰¹ The Eucharist, then, was seen by AFSA members to be an act in the progressive re-ordering of the life of humanity through the Incarnation. John Kirby wrote,

In that service man takes the things of nature, bread and wine, and offers them to God; God receives the bread and wine, purges them of the corporate sin of mankind with which they are stained, and having blessed them, gives them back to man, charged with His very Presence and His very Self. ... The bread of earth becomes the bread of heaven that earth might be lifted to heaven...¹⁰²

This view of the Eucharist was both a support to and a demand for Christian

100. AO 1,14 (May 15, 1946) p.19.

101. AO 1,15 (June 1, 1946) p.20.

102. AO 1,9 (March 1, 1946) p.19.

involvement in social change. It was a support in that it assumed that the transformation of society, and not only individual persons, lies at the heart of the sacrament. It was a demand in that it brought the sin of the world into the liturgy, and so brought into focus the dissonance between the *status quo* and the Kingdom of God. John Wagland wrote,

... through the offering of bread and wine in the Eucharist, the Church is unavoidably involved in the moral problems of production, labour relations, distribution and all the injustices of our complicated economy.¹⁰³

How could the church remain satisfied with such an imperfect offering? The notion that the bread and wine represented the whole life of society prompted the church to make of them as pure an offering as possible by working to re-order the dis-ordered relationships found in society. The transformation of the elements in the Eucharist also prompted individual Christians to carry forward the transformation of society in their daily lives.

Theological Ideas

There are no specifically theological texts by AFSA members. The group's literary legacy is not a work of systematic theology, but an assortment of polemical and didactic articles in various religious periodicals. This renders impossible the task of presenting a clear and consistent "AFSA theology". The group did much of its thinking "on its feet" and none of the members' writings were directed to an academic audience. AFSA was primarily action-oriented and, therefore, its literary output was intended more to gather support for its activity in the Church and society than it was to argue a particular theological point. This does not mean that the

103. J.F. Wagland, "Labour in the Eucharist," *AO* 3,11 (Sept. 1948) p.18.

group had no theological terms of reference. It should be apparent from the preceding discussion that the group shared some very strong opinions on the meaning of the faith in the context of post-war Canada. However, in advocating a theological position, AFSA was only concerned to promote a "new orthodoxy" to the extent that it led to a radically different praxis. In this section, I will sketch the central ideas which appear to have supported and informed AFSA's activity. I will then complete our view of these ideas with reference to other groups and individuals whose thinking influenced the group in Montreal.

AFSA's theological position was dependent on two themes: the Incarnation and human solidarity or "brotherhood". The first of these is related to process or method and points to a sacramental understanding of the universe and redemption. The second is related to content or direction and points to a social understanding of personhood. Both have their roots in a critique of Western capitalism -- the individualism which informs the *status quo* and the spiritualized Christianity which supports it.

In the "Wordmade Flesh", AFSA discovered an understanding of the relationship of God to the created order. The "co-operation of the human and the divine" in Jesus affirmed human-ness. That God "was made man" demonstrated unequivocally "that God uses human faculties as the vehicle for His revelation instead of overriding or suppressing them."¹⁰⁴ In and through Christ, then, the ultimate value of personhood is affirmed and our true humanity is revealed. Furthermore, the Incarnation was seen to affirm the whole material order. It established that "the world of space and time and history, with

¹⁰⁴. AO 7,2 (Dec. 1951) p.6.

all its confusions of ignorance and error and sin" is the locus of divine activity and the arena of salvation.¹⁰⁵ The Incarnation was thus seen to be the final statement in the relationship of God and the world.¹⁰⁶ At the same time, AFSA understood it to be the first act in the redemption of the world. The group considered this redemption to be an historical process in which a new order is established as the Incarnation is "extended".¹⁰⁷ As men and women open themselves to Christ and receive the Word made Flesh, both individuals and their social relationships are changed -- the created order is restored to God and His Kingdom is established.

This view of the material world as the realm in which God has established the process of redemption was AFSA's apologetic for social action. If Christ is active in us, then we must be active in the world. AFSA's view of the Church as the means by which the Incarnation is extended was the basis of the group's demand that the Church should be different from the mainstream of society. Because the world as it is fails to fulfill the vision of human-ness revealed in Christ, the Church, as Christ's agent in the world, must stand apart from it.

Whereas capitalism invested meaning in "having", seeing the value of persons to be a function of what they possessed, AFSA held that the Gospel invested meaning in "being", seeing the value of persons to be unconditional and a function of our status as children of God. More specifically, the group considered the primary mode of human-ness to be "being with", as all persons

105. *Ibid.*

106. *Ibid.*

107. See, "The Incarnation Today", *AO* 6,2 (Dec. 1950) p.7.

share a common status with respect to the Creator. This was the human solidarity revealed in Christ.

AFSA's view of personhood was a judgement on the social and ecclesiastical *status quo*. It was expressed most clearly in an *Anglican Outlook* editorial which read, "A new faith must be worked out in which community replaces property as the sacrament of life."¹⁰⁸ A similar attitude can be found in other groups of the time. The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, in its "Basis of Agreement and Constitution, 1935", affirmed that "the impulse to multiply possessions, which is encouraged by institutions based on private property, is an effectual barrier to spiritual development."¹⁰⁹ This impediment was seen to be a product of laissez-faire capitalism and its individualism.¹¹⁰ In response, the FCSO promoted an organic view of society and an understanding of human-ness as related-ness. They saw the person primarily as a member of "mutual relations"¹¹¹ and they considered Christianity "a religion of persons-in-community."¹¹² In *Towards the Christian Revolution* John Line wrote,

But whereas totalitarianism imposes unity or solidarity from above, Christianity creates among men a common spirit; and it is through this that it promises to preserve a true individualism while

108. "Whither Bound?", *AO* 7,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

109. FCSO, "Basis of Agreement and Constitution, 1935" in Roger Hutchison, *FCSO*, p.273.

110. Cf., John Line, "The Philosophical Background" in R.B.Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos, eds., *Towards the Christian Revolution* (Chicago & New York: Willett, Coark & Company, 1936) pp.1-25

112. Cf., R.B.Y. Scott, *Ibid.*, p.76. See also, Hutchison, *FCSO*, pp.28f.

gathering men into a unified life. The will toward mutuality which it inspires and enjoins is at once the law of inner social cohesion and the expression of the highest attributes of personal nature. Socialist Christianity rests upon the conviction that because of the natural unity of life this law of mutuality must be applied to outer relations as well as inward.¹¹³

Another contributor wrote,

The church's special function, then, is to keep men conscious of God and the community, for they belong to both. These are not independent and unrelated, but two aspects of something that is an organic whole. Intimacy with God involves mutuality among men, and that not alone within a select, congenial group, but among all men.¹¹⁴

In response to the individualism of capitalism, then, both AFSA and the FCSO used a vision of human-ness as "being-with" and an understanding of Christianity as a social religion.

AFSA and the FCSO also shared a similar understanding of the religious value of the historical and material world, although they arrived at that valuation in very different ways. The FCSO's position developed as that group attempted to deprivatize salvation and locate the Kingdom of God within history.¹¹⁵ John Line avoided a discussion of "theoretical or metaphysical materialism" in *Towards the Christian Revolution*, but he used a discussion of Evangelical Orthodoxy, Liberal Modernism, Barthianism, Neo-Thomism, and Whitehead's process thought as the basis for projecting a "Radical Christianity".¹¹⁶ This faith was materialistic in the sense that it removed

113. John Line, *Toward the Christian Revolution*, p.22.

114. J.W.A. Nicholson, *Ibid.*, p.176.

115. See Hutchison, *FCSO*, pp.138f.

116. Cf., John Line, "The Theological Principles" in *Towards the Christian Revolution*, pp.26-50.

religion from its bondage to a narrow definition of spirituality. Line extended the Evangelical notion of sin to include those acts and processes by which power is used and wealth is amassed, and he considered the fruit of repentance to be the will to transform the unjust conditions found in society. While this Religious Radicalism was critical of the naive and Utopian immanentism found in the pre-war social gospel's reliance on the notion of progress, it also rejected as "Manichaeism" the Barthian view of the disparity between the human and the divine. Line wrote,

(Radical Christianity) will agree that man has not the means to save himself but must look to forces in the universe and in history that are not his to command. The action of these forces, in an era like ours, may be catastrophic, events moving too swiftly for their triumph to come solely through the gradual increase of good will and confidence. Thus the theology of Religious Radicalism will be eschatological; it will picture God as judging the world and taking sides. And this will dictate the strategy of a revolutionary Christianity, which will clearly include alignment with the forces God is using to accomplish the next stage in man's deliverance.¹¹⁷

This affirmation of history was shared by AFSA, although a more metaphysical orientation is suggested by the Anglican group's reliance on the Incarnation. The FCSO did not rely on an understanding of sacramentality, but argued for the importance of material relationships on the strength of the biblical tradition. R.B.Y. Scott wrote:

The religion of the Mosaic tradition, expounded and clarified by the prophets and culminating in Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom, is a religion of persons-in-community. ... It is not an other-world religion but concerns itself in a frankly realistic manner with the way men live together here and now.¹¹⁸

117. *Ibid.*, p.48.

118. R.B.Y. Scott, *Ibid.*, p.76.

The position indicated by the "Group of Churchmen" who published *The Return of Christendom* was much closer to AFSA's. Percy Widdrington wrote that "the two foes the Church must defeat are Manicheism within its own borders, and Materialism in the world outside."¹¹⁹ He and his followers believed that the Materialism of society had removed from politics and economics the consideration of spiritual values, while the Manicheism of the Church had removed the consideration of material relationships from the purview of religion.¹²⁰ Widdrington hoped that a restoration of eschatology would lead to an understanding of the Kingdom as this-worldly or next-worldly, rather than other-worldly. In this sense, then, he shared with AFSA and the FCSO a positive valuation of the historical plane as the locus of salvation. Unlike the FCSO, however, the contributors to *The Return of Christendom* tended to see in the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Eucharist the fundamental expressions of and apologetic for a materialist faith and the unity of spiritual and material goods. For example, L.S. Thornton wrote,

All social relationships are through the medium of our bodily life. A full redemption of man, therefore, will take into its scope the whole social structure and all the outward order of human life as it is lived in the body. The dogma that "the Word was made flesh" declares the goodness and value of everything that belongs to the common life of man and its outward expression. It reasserts the truth of Creation that "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good." The same truth is emphasized in another way by the miracle of the Resurrection. The body of the Lord was raised from the tomb as a natural corollary of all that had gone before.

119. P.E.T. Widdrington, "The Return of 'The Kingdom of God'," in A Group of Churchmen, *The Return of Christendom*, p.109.

120. Cf., *Ibid.*, pp.83f.

... In this way it was made plain that the whole of human life, body as well as spirit, had been redeemed.¹²¹

AFSA reflects such an approach to traditional doctrines.

A more explicitly materialist understanding of the process of redemption was expounded by Frederick Hastings Smyth, a thinker whose Society of the Catholic Commonwealth attracted some AFSA members, as we have already noted. There are, to date, no studies dealing specifically with Smyth's thought in a detailed and systematic manner, and this indicates a gap in the theological literature.¹²² I will only describe his thinking briefly in order to relate it to AFSA's position. Smyth shared in the positive valuation of the created order,¹²³ but he differed from the FCSO and the "Group of Churchmen" in his emphasis on the priority of the material over the spiritual in the process of redemption. He made his argument for this priority in his major work, *Manhood into God*. There he wrote,

It is very significant that God initiates His process of re-ordering the world, on the level of what we call *matter*. The Process of the Incarnation, that is, of re-creation of the world, begins logically, as did the first creation, within the material world. Only later does this Process extend itself into the levels of mind and spirit. Thus, the Catholic Religion, as the Religion of the Incarnation, is, in a sense, rooted in a proper and throughgoing materialism; for the method of the Incarnation demonstrates to us that the necessary and prerequisite foundation for all intellectual and spiritual order is, so far as this world is concerned, the development of an organized material body.¹²⁴

121. *Ibid.*

122. I have found one short article. See, John L. Kater, Jr., "Forgotten Prophet: A Note on the Theology of Frederick Hastings Smyth", *Anglican Theological Review* LV,1 (Jan. 1973) 73-77.

123. See, Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Discerning the Lord's Body: The Rationale of a Catholic Democracy* (Louisville, Ky.: The Clister Press, 1946) pp.1-9

124. Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Manhood into God* (New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1940) pp.108-109.

Smyth attempted to describe the process of redemption or the extension of the Incarnation with reference to a particular interpretation of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The element of that traditional doctrine on which he focused was the perfection and transformation of the bread and wine, but he wished to expand this idea by relating it to the whole created order and making it a paradigm for the whole process of redemption itself. The term he used to refer to this transformation of the created order was "metacosmesis" or "transordination".¹²⁵ The Incarnation, understood in this sacramental sense, was for Smyth the prototypical metacosmesis. The process was seen to involve three stages: first, the lifting of the human to the order of the divine, as God took human nature into Himself; second, the perfection of that humanity through sacrifice and, ultimately, the sacrifice of the Cross; and finally, the return of the perfected or re-ordered humanity to the disordered creation as an agent of the continuing process of re-ordering. The ultimate expression of this stage was the Resurrection.¹²⁶

Generally speaking, AFSA did not employ Smyth's metaphysics. However, his concept of metacosmesis would appear to have influenced the interpretation of the Eucharist presented by John Kirby and outlined above. This is interesting because Kirby did not join the SCC. The parallel between Smyth and Kirby is very strong, as both related the Eucharist to the extending of the Incarnation and the process of redemption, seeing the bread and wine as representative of the sinful, contingent life of the world, and both emphasized the process of the Mass in which the elements are offered to God, transformed,

¹²⁵. These are terms which Smyth came to prefer to "transubstantiation". See *Discerning the Lord's Body*, Preface and p.48, n.21.

¹²⁶. See *Ibid.*, pp.46ff.

and returned to His people charged with divine power.¹²⁷

While Smyth's thought was used by AFSA members to interpret the Eucharist, his was not the strongest influence on the group. Rather, it would appear that the group was most conscious of its dependence on the thought of William Temple, particularly as this was developed in *Christianity and Social Order* (1942).¹²⁸ Temple focused on both of the themes we have identified as basic to AFSA's position, but his treatment of them differed from that of the others we have been considering. While elements of a sacramental view of the universe and an understanding of personhood as social can be found in the FCSO, the "Group of Churchmen", and Hastings Smyth, both themes are fully developed and united in Temple. They form the foundation of his social teaching.

Temple worked toward these themes from an analysis of modernity. This analysis is most clearly presented in Lecture III of *Nature, Man and God*, although elements of it are found elsewhere in his writings, notably in *Christianity and Social Order*. He began by explaining the Medieval synthesis in terms of the authority of the Church over Theology. He likened the pre-modern thought-world to an arch comprised of philosophy, metaphysics, logic, politics, ethics and economics, with Theology as the "keystone of its arch." Given the "monolithic"¹²⁹ nature of that world, Temple concluded that the only breach in the

127. See *Ibid.*, pp.63ff.

128. "The Arundel Group and the Anglican Outlook", *AO* 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.10; "Farewell -- And Hail", *AO* 15,8 (June-July, 1960) pp.6f.

129. Such a view of the medieval world as a monolith has been challenged. In objective terms, a point of view accessible to us only by the grace of time, it is true that there existed within medieval Europe a certain diversity of opinion and practice. However true this may be, it does not invalidate Temple's analysis, but sharpens it, for the world of Erasmus, Luther, da Vinci, Galileo, and Copernicus was, no doubt, experienced as something of a monolith as far as the authority of the Church was concerned.

structure could have been sustained by some sort of individualism, as was the case. He wrote,

If a man's thoughts and purposes were no longer to take their start from the only tradition available, where could they begin? And the only possible answer was "with himself". If a man was not going to start as a member of a system, accepting that system and his own place in it, then he must start with his isolated self. ... So the modern movement was bound to be a movement of individualism. We owe to it the distinctive blessing of modern life, but also its distinctive ills.¹³⁰

According to Temple, this individualism found its spiritual expression in Luther's *Hier ich stehe, ich kann nicht anders* and its philosophical or metaphysical expression in Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*. Both of these express the principle of "private judgement", not only as a right, but as a duty. Temple considered this principle to be most dangerous as expressed by Descartes by virtue of "the inherent error of its initial assumption that in knowledge the mind begins with itself and proceeds to the apprehension of the external world by way of construction and inference."¹³¹ Thus the *Cogito* promotes "the assumption of an epistemological and (consequently) ... a metaphysical priority of the Subject in the Subject-Object relation of knowledge."¹³² The knower somehow takes on a greater reality than that which is known. This aspect of the principle of private judgement implies that the individual's ideas and experience are somehow more important, more trustworthy, and more "real" than those of others around him. The implications of this tendency for the medieval world view and its "keystone", theology, were devastating.

¹³⁰. William Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, The Gifford Lectures of 1932-33 and 1933-34, (London: Macmillan, 1960) p.62.

¹³¹. *Ibid.*, p.73.

¹³². *Ibid.*, p.72.

All of this is the groundwork for Temple's insight into the state of modern life. He said,

... the chief characteristic of the modern or post-Reformation period has been departmentalisation. The great enterprise of all-inclusive unity, which was characteristic of the Middle Ages, was progressively abandoned.¹³³

As the focus of knowledge moved from Theology or the Church to the judgement of the individual, so the various areas of human endeavour became focused on themselves. Politics, art, literature, science, philosophy, and religion all sought to understand the world from within their own perspectives and without reference to each other. With respect to the place of religion in this departmentalisation of human experience, he made his point most clearly when he spoke of World War I. He saw the war as the result of "various instances of national self-assertion", and said,

The check which it might have been hoped that Religion would exercise could not be applied, for Religion also had become departmentalised, and was by most people regarded as a "private affair between a man and his Maker", so that its main if not its only concern was with personal piety.¹³⁴

It was such an analysis which informed AFSA's assertion that Christianity is a social religion. AFSA perceived such an over-riding concern with personal faith, to the exclusion of most other concerns (except, of course, the preservation of the institution), in the official Church when its critique of the political and economic life of Western capitalism was met by the claim that the faith has nothing to do with these things, that its proper concern is the relationship between individuals and their Lord. Temple showed that

¹³³. *Ibid.*, p.76.

¹³⁴. *Ibid.*

this attitude is rooted in modernity and its malaise: it was the departmentalisation of the whole of life and the Church's accommodation to that trend which rendered it "improper" for the church to speak on any issues except those within its "proper" sphere of personal piety. Neither AFSA nor Temple denied the importance of personal faith, but they were critical of such a limitation of religion.

In his argument against this limitation, Temple did not deny the importance of special expertise in the various "departments" of life. Rather, he was concerned to indicate the dangers inherent in the principle of private judgement: the fact that, while emancipating different areas of human endeavour from the overbearing authority of Theology, it also severed the relationships of every part of life one to another and, at its worst, permitted a licentious detachment of the claims of one area from those of another. He illustrated this well by using some familiar folk maxims. He wrote,

"Art for Art's sake" ... is perhaps the most refined form of the principle of departmentalisation which finds its grossest expression in the formula "Business is business" and its most immoral in "My country, right or wrong."¹³⁵

In response to this dis-integration and the relegation of religion to matters of personal piety, Temple said that "the Church has to regain lost ground" and reassert its right to be heard on matters of politics and economics.¹³⁶ He was not proposing that the Church take over the task or the work of politicians and economists. In fact, he warned against compromising the Church's right to speak by ignoring "the autonomy of technique." In so doing, he expressed a certain respect for the divisions created by modernity,¹³⁷ and made it clear

^{135.} *Ibid.*, p.77.

^{136.} William Temple, *Christianity and Social Order* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1942) p.30

^{137.} *Ibid.*, pp.16f.

that he was not advocating a return to the Middle Ages. He considered this undesirable, let alone impossible. However, he did say,

It is our task consciously and deliberately to construct a "synthesis" of the classical and medieval "thesis" with the modern "antithesis", and this in some fundamental respects will resemble the "thesis" more closely than the "antithesis".¹³⁸

He was not advocating a total repudiation of modernity, but he believed that, while "the autonomy of the individual conscience", "the duty of private judgement", and "the integrity of the individual mind" would not be forgotten, the new synthesis would strive to resolve the apparent contradiction between the principles of individual autonomy and corporate authority in favour of the latter. Given the contradictions of modernity, what was needed was "a fresh recognition of the essential nature of Authority as distinct from either coercion or dictation" and "the appreciation of man's ethical problem as primarily one of conversion and vocation".¹³⁹ Temple did not address this problem directly. In a sense he by-passed it by looking to Christian theology to provide a normative view of humankind in the world. He discovered in the Incarnation or "the sacramental principle" the basis of an organic understanding of the material world as a unity and a relational understanding of personhood.

In *Nature, Man and God*, Temple used the sacramental principle to describe "the special relationship of spirit and matter" or "the reality of matter and the supremacy of spirit." Quite simply, this principle refers to "a spiritual utilisation of a material object whereby a spiritual result is effected"¹⁴⁰ or "an actual conveyance of spiritual meaning and power by

138. Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p.80.

139. *Ibid.*, p.81.

140. *Ibid.*, p.491

a material process."¹⁴¹ He explored the sacramental principle in discussions of the relationships of Time and Eternity ("The Meaning of History") and Spirit and Matter ("The Sacramental Universe"),¹⁴² and worked toward the conclusion that,

By the nature of its central doctrine, Christianity is committed to a belief in the ultimate significance of the historical process, and in the reality of matter and its place in the divine scheme.¹⁴³

Temple began his argument from the point of view of Natural Theology and the scientific worldview. He assumed an evolutionary process of development from inanimate matter to human personality and focused on the emergence of mind and human knowing to prove that spirit emerged from matter. Temple suggested that, in order for mind to emerge within the material process, it must have been present in some form from the beginning. Thus he arrives at the sacramental principle as the expression of spirit through matter. Unlike Smyth, who emphasized the priority of matter, Temple emphasized the priority of spirit. He said,

In the sacrament then the order of thought is spirit first and spirit last, with matter as the effectual expression or symbolic instrument of spirit. That is the formula which we suggest as an articulation of the essential relations of spirit and matter in the universe.¹⁴⁴

The theological statement of Temple's conclusion was that God who created and informed the material world, who became incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, continues to inform and sustain the world. God first and God last, with

141. *Ibid.*, p.484.

142. See *Ibid.*, pp.427f. and pp.473f.

143. *Ibid.*, p.478.

144. *Ibid.*, p.492.

matter as the instrument of his purpose. Thus Temple arrived at a view of the universe in which Spirit encompasses all. God initiates, informs and consummates the world process, and all of human existence, material, individual, and social, comes under the plan of redemption. This incarnational or sacramental perspective was the basis of all of Temple's social teaching.¹⁴⁵ Within it, no sphere of human activity was "left to its own devices", but the whole of life was presented as acceptable to God and the object of his purposive love. Temple wrote,

It is in the sacramental view of the universe, both of its material and spiritual elements, that there is given hope of making human both politics and economics and of making effectual both faith and love.¹⁴⁶

The departmentalised view of religion and its limited notion of redemption was thus rendered a theological impossibility and the church was thrust into the problem of politics and economics.

The important difference between Temple and AFSA's position, on the one hand, and that of Smyth, on the other, was the order of their presentation. Smyth began with the material process of the Incarnation through which the fallen, created order is trans-ordered. Temple acknowledged that the process is material, but stressed its spiritual origin and end more strongly than did Smyth. Therefore, whereas Smyth understood salvation to be the participation in the process of the extension of the Incarnation through the Church, as Christ's Body in the world, Temple and AFSA understood salvation to depend on the realization of certain spiritual values. AFSA is obviously

¹⁴⁵. Cf., Robert Craig, *Social Concern in the Thought of William Temple* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1963) p.16.

¹⁴⁶. Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p.486.

closer to Temple in that it argued for the transformation of material relationships in accordance with the human solidarity revealed in Jesus and the mutuality implied by our common status as children of God.

Temple's view of personhood as social was related to his critique of modernity and its focus on the individual. Whereas the medieval synthesis has been broken by the assertion of individual autonomy, the new synthesis required a re-assertion and a new understanding of the individual's related-ness. Temple firmly believed that persons are essentially and necessarily social. He said, "we are all part of one another" and "by the constitution of our nature we are bound up with one another."¹⁴⁷ In *Nature, Man and God* he argued this point on the basis of the universal human experience of "obligation". While moralities differ, ethical questions are asked by all persons and, as these questions inevitably involve the relationships of persons, Temple concluded that membership in a community of persons or society is "part of the constitution of our nature".¹⁴⁸ This understanding of the social nature of human being was also developed in Temple's discussion of sin, as he considered sin to be self-centredness -- the subordination of the claims of other conscious beings to the claims of the self.¹⁴⁹ This approach addressed the departmentalised view of religion which implied that sin and righteousness were only issues in the relationship of the individual believer and the Creator. These were understood by Temple to be relational issues involving the individual, God, and the community. AFSA shared such an understanding of the person-in-community.

¹⁴⁷. *Ibid.*, p.xx

¹⁴⁸. *Ibid.*, p.189. See also pp.166f

¹⁴⁹. See *Ibid.*, pp.356f.

The picture of AFSA which emerges from this discussion of theological foundations is one of a group which borrowed ideas from a number of contemporary sources and used them to support its action in the Church and society. The themes of an incarnational or sacramental understanding of reality and a relational vision of human-ness are primary in AFSA's thinking, but these were variously informed and nuanced by the thought of other groups and individuals. While this eclectic tendency sometimes makes it difficult to discern the group's position, it helps to explain why AFSA never produced a systematic theology for itself. It did not consider such a task to be necessary. The theological groundwork supportive of radical Christian social action had already been produced in the work of others such as Temple, Smyth, and the FCSO. The group's dependency on these others and its failure to introduce new ideas suggest that the intellectual milieu provided ample resources for the movement. What was needed was not more theology, but more action.

CONCLUSION

In the Introduction to this thesis I described my purpose in terms of a look to the past in search of spiritual and theological resources to support Christians who, having acknowledged the death of Christendom, find themselves alienated from the *status quo* and have become engaged in some action in the struggle to transform it. In the Introduction I also noted that, while Canadians have looked primarily to the Methodist-United Church tradition for such support, there have been no studies of the contributions which the Anglican tradition might offer, and I identified the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action as a potential resource. In the first chapter I described elements of the group's context: the tradition of sacramental or incarnational socialism in Britain; William Temple and the Malvern Conference; Canadian responses to Malvern; and the Second World War as an influence on the popular attitude to social change. The second chapter attempted to tell AFSA's story by outlining its origins, its goals and the means used to achieve them, the opposition it encountered, and the reasons for its decline. Finally, in the third chapter, I examined more closely the group's thinking on the state of society, the Church, and its relationship to the world. In so doing, I identified the Incarnation and "brotherhood" as two fundamental theological themes which informed AFSA's thought and I noted other individuals and groups, especially William Temple, by whom the group may have been influenced in this regard. In this Conclusion, I wish to return to the purpose stated in the Introduction and suggest some of the ways that AFSA may be a resource to Christians who cannot accept the world as it is and feel themselves called to change it.

In their recent book, *The Pastoral Counsellor in Social Action*, Speed Leas

and Paul Kittlaus list a number of the feelings experienced by those involved in "action ministries".¹ Three of these are: "feeling isolated", "feeling up against overwhelming odds", and "feeling unsupported by the Church." In general, AFSA is a spiritual resource as its story addresses these feelings. Christians engaged in their own struggles for justice can recognize in AFSA a group which shares their basic orientation to and relationship with the world -- AFSA was another small group, alienated from the Church and society, which struggled against the dominant forces of its day in an attempt to transform a sinful world. This discovery of a "sympathetic other" or an "ally" affirms their alienation, confirms their action in the world, and so ministers to their sense of isolation, powerlessness, and abandonment. AFSA's story, then, is a spiritual gift as it enables other alienated Christians to transcend, if only briefly, the debilitating elements of their experience and animates them to re-enter their situation with strength and courage to carry on. Of course, as I noted in the Introduction, this is a resource which can be and is offered as those involved in work for social justice meet and share their experiences. Supportive relationships are founded on such a sense of solidarity and collaboration. In the case of AFSA, the important discovery is of a solidarity with the past.

Beyond this general sense of solidarity, there are some specific elements of AFSA's story which may be or become supportive. I mention them here because they indicate ideas or themes for further study. For instance, AFSA's historical context and the official responses of the Canadian Church to the

1. Speed Leas and Paul Kittlaus, *The Pastoral Counsellor in Social Action* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1981) pp.22f.

Malvern Conference suggests that war has a deep effect on the Church's willingness to move beyond its habitual accommodation to capitalism. Such a conclusion might be upheld by an examination of the relationship of the Social Gospel in Canada and the First World War and of the American experience of Viet Nam. Similarly, the move to the right which followed the Second World War and the stand taken by the Church in that context suggests that the Church is timid in the face of a strident "capitalism in retrenchment". This could relate to the emerging situation of the "new right" in North America. In the light of its opposition, AFSA's supportive role is deepened. The group's resistance to the tide is empowering because it conveys a courage to persevere today in the proclamation of an unpopular gospel.

Both spiritual and theological support may be found in AFSA's theological "method" and its understanding of worship. As I have shown, the group was eclectic and activist. AFSA borrowed or imported theological ideas from a number of sources and so remained free of new orthodoxies or systems. Its primary goal was the transformation of sinful structures in the Church and society rather than the promotion of a particular point of view. This orientation may affirm the activist stance assumed by many of those currently involved in social change projects. It may also help to legitimize the use of a number of theological sources to support action. AFSA's example suggests that, rather than striving for a "system" and intellectual self-sufficiency, groups of alienated Christians should be free to adopt and develop the ideas of others. By remaining free of new orthodoxies, AFSA may have been able to respond more creatively and appropriately to its situation.

On the other hand, AFSA's story suggests that such eclecticism involves a risk. The lack of a consistent, integrated theological position prompted some to join the SCC and this eventually led to conflict in AFSA. While the

disagreement between the two groups may have been more a function of Hastings Smyth's dogmatism than the result of AFSA's lack of integration, the fact that some AFSA members looked to the SCC points to a need or desire for such consistency. Thus, while borrowing and interpreting the ideas of others may be more helpful in framing an apologetic for action, it may also become a cause of division within a group as these various sources enter into conflict.

AFSA's understanding of the Eucharist may be helpful as it points to a model of piety which acknowledges the social aspects of redemption. While it was critical of traditional forms of worship and their individualistic appeal, the group was able to transcend its critique and celebrate the Eucharist because it saw the bread and wine to be representative of the whole human life, including the social relationships which inform human-ness. Thus AFSA came to understand the liturgy as a sacramental representation of God's redemptive activity in the world. For many, alienation from the Church involves alienation from the Church's worship. The interpretation of the Eucharist promoted by AFSA may offer a way of worshipping together again which is focused on the struggle to act as God's agent in society. It may also offer a way of addressing positively the Church's failure to account for social justice in its daily worship.

In general, AFSA may become a theological resource as it points to interpretations of important doctrinal themes which are supportive of Christian social action. The ideas used by the group may help others to recover and reconstruct the theological traditions of Western orthodoxy. I have already referred to AFSA's view of the Eucharist. The most important example in this regard is the group's continual reference to the Incarnation as a symbol or sacrament of God's affirmation of the world as the arena of

redemption. For AFSA, the fact that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" necessarily implied that redemption involves both inter-personal and material dimensions. Because of this assumption, the group was able to avoid the kind of argument for social action which is based on a moral appeal to what "ought" to be considered within the realm of Christian faith. Rather, AFSA's emphasis on the Incarnation enabled it to argue for the transformation of economic and social relationships on the basis of a meditation on the very heart of the Gospel.

This reliance on the Incarnation, the image which lies at the core of the Christian tradition, suggests the most powerful sense in which AFSA may be both a theological and spiritual support to those who are disaffiliated or marginalized. The struggle to change sinful social structures often engenders anger directed at the institutional Church and its oppressive actions in the past which may have contributed to a sinful situation. Unfortunately, this anger occasionally leads to an unequivocal rejection of the Church's past, as if it were only in this generation that critical consciousness has emerged. The tragedy in this dynamic lies in the fact that many of those who reject the Church and its traditions feel they must do so because of their faith, yet they fail to understand that their faith was born of the same tradition which they reject. By turning their backs on the Church, Christians who are committed to changing the *status quo* may be losing a valuable resource for their mission. The story of AFSA may temper this trend and serve as a point of re-entry into the Christian tradition. The coincidence of a radical critique of the Church and the *status quo* with an appeal to traditional doctrinal themes such as the Incarnation and the Eucharist makes AFSA an example of self-transcendence.

It demonstrates how God enables the Church to move beyond itself without stepping out of its skin. If AFSA's story is heard, it suggests that alienated Christians can find in the past other individuals and groups representative of this self-transcendence whose ideas and actions may support the struggle against the principalities and powers of this world. It is my hope that, by hearing of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action, others may return to their traditions to recover lost voices of radical prophecy and re-tell the stories of those who moved against the stream in faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Anglican Outlook. 1945-1960

Canadian Churchman, 1940-1960

Council for Social Service. *Bulletin*, 101,103,103S,105,106.

_____, *Annual Report*, 1941, 1942.

General Synod. *Journal of Proceedings*, 1943, 1946, 1949, 1952, 1955
1959.

General Synod Archives. *Canada and Christendom* file.

Interviews with Dr. J.C. Flanagan, the Rev. V.I. Goring, the Rev.
J.C. Kirby, the Rev. J.O. Peacock, the Rev. S.L. Pollard, and
Prof. C.H. Powles.

Montreal Churchman, 1940-46

Papers of Prof. C.H. Powles. AFSA file.

Papers of the Rev. Frederick Hastings Smyth. AFSA file.

Synod of the Diocese of Montreal. *Journal of Proceedings*, 1940-1960.

Other Sources

Allen, Richard. *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in
Canada 1914-1928*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Baum, Gregory. *Catholics and Canadian Socialism: Political Thought
in the Thirties and Forties*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1980.

_____. "A Look to the Past for the Sake of the Future."
Paper presented to the 1977 conference of the Institute for Christian
Life in Canada, Toronto, August 21-27, 1977

Carmichael, John D., and Goodwin, Harold S. *William Temple's
Political Legacy: A Critical Assessment*. London: Mowbrays, 1963.

Carrington, Philip. *The Anglican Church in Canada: A History*.
Toronto: Collins, 1963.

- Cone, James H. *A Black Theology of Liberation*. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1970
- Cooper, John Irwin. *The Blessed Communion*. Montreal: The Archives Committee of the Diocese of Montreal, 1960.
- Craig, Robert. *Social Concern in the Thought of William Temple*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1963.
- Crysdale, Stewart. *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada*. Toronto, 1961.
- Fletcher, Joseph. *William Temple: Twentieth-Century Christian*. New York: Seabury Press, 1963.
- Gore, Charles, ed. *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. London: John Murray, 1890.
- Grant, John Webster. *The Church in the Canadian Era: The First Century of Confederation*. Vol. III of *A History of the Christian Church in Canada*. Edited by John Webster Grant. 3 vols. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1973.
- A Group of Churchmen. *The Return of Christendom*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1922.
- Hall, Douglas John. *The Canada Crisis: A Christian Perspective*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1980
- Hebert, A.G. *Liturgy and Society: The Function of the Church in the Modern World*. London: Faber and Faber, 1935.
- Horowitz, Gad. *Canadian Labour in Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Hutchison, Roger. *The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: A Social Ethical Analysis of a Christian Socialist Movement*. Unpublished ThD dissertation, Victoria University, Toronto, 1975.
- Iremonger, F.A. *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters*. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Jones, Peter d'A. *The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914: Religion, Class, and Social Conscience in Late-Victorian England*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Kater, John L., Jr. "Forgotten Prophet: A Note on the Theology of Frederick Hastings Smyth." *Anglican Theological Review*, LV,1 (January, 1973), 73-77.
- Lloyd, Roger. *The Church of England, 1900-1965*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Malvern 1941: *The Proceedings of the Archbishop of York's Conference*. London: Longman's, Green, 1941.

Matthews, W.R., ed. *William Temple: An Estimate and an Appreciation*. London: Clarke, 1946.

Morgan, Edward J.E. *The Anglican Church and Social Action: The Effect of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action on the Development of Social Action in the Anglican Church of Canada*. Unpublished M.Th. thesis, Toronto School of Theology (Trinity College), Toronto, 1974.

Pulker, Edward Alfred. *The Role of Anglicans in Reform of the Economic Order in Canada, 1914-1945*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, 1973.

Ramsay, Arthur Michael. *An Era in Anglican Theology: From Gore to Temple*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.

Reckitt, Maurice B. *Church and Society in England from 1800*. Vol. III of *The Church and the World: Being Materials for the Historical Study of Christian Sociology*. Edited by Cyril E. Hudson and Maurice B. Reckitt. 3 Vols. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1940

_____. *Faith and Society: A Study of the Structure, Outlook and Opportunity of the Christian Social Movement in Great Britain and the United States of America*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.

_____. *Maurice to Temple: A Century in the Social Movement in the Church of England*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947.

Scott, R.B.Y. and Vlastos, Gregory, eds. *Towards the Christian Revolution*. Chicago & New York: Willett, Coark & Co., 1936.

Smillie, B.G., ed. *Political Theology in the Canadian Context*. Unpublished papers of the conference held at the University of Saskatoon, Saskatoon, March 10-11, 1977.

Smyth, Frederick Hastings. *Discerning the Lord's Body: The Rationale of a Catholic Democracy*. Louisville, KY: The Cloister Press, 1946.

_____. *Manhood Into God*. New York: Round Table Press, 1940.

Temple, William. *A Conditional Justification of War*. A Hodder and Staughton Pamphlet on the Spiritual Issues of the War. London: Hodder & Staughton, 1941

_____. *Christ the Truth*. New York: Macmillan, 1924. (English edition titled *Christus Veritas*.)

_____. *Christianity and Social Order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1942.

_____. "The Church and the Labour Party." *Economic Review* 18 (1908) 190-202.

_____. *The Church and Its Teaching Today*. The William Belden Noble Lectures, Harvard University, December, 1935. New York: Macmillan, 1936.

_____. *Church and Nation*. The Paddock Lectures, The General Theological Seminary, New York, May, 1915. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

_____. *Citizen and Churchman*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1941.

_____. *Mens Creatrix: An Essay*. London: Macmillan, 1917.

_____. *Nature, Man and God*. The Gifford Lectures for 1932-33 and 1933-34, London and New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Wolf, William J., ed. *The Spirit of Anglicanism*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1979.